

FAITH AND FREEDOM



A JOURNAL OF
PROGRESSIVE RELIGION

30259

Volume II
Part I

AUTUMN
1957

Number
31

FAITH AND FREEDOM

A JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RELIGION

Editor: E. SHIRVELL PRICE, M.A.

Assistant Editor: A. K. ROSS, B.C.L., M.A.

Associate Editor: JAMES L. ADAMS, Ph.D.

VOL. 11, PART 1

AUTUMN 1957

NUMBER 31

EDITORIAL: HOUR OF CHALLENGE	1
LETTERS—I: Practical Steps following the "Call to Freedom" from ARTHUR L. BLAKE ..	5
II: Expostulation from JOHN M. MORRIS ..	7
III: A Plea for Creativeness in God concept from HENRY OZER	9
THE GOD OF WORSHIP F. J. HAMBLIN	13
IS GOD NECESSARY? Edward Ericson	23
APPEAL TO HUMANITY ALBERT SCHWEITZER	33
THE LIBERAL CHURCH OF THE FUTURE KURT HANSLOWE and CONSTANCE YOUNG	40



LAUNCHED AT THE INSTANCE OF THE OLD
STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION OF MANCHESTER
COLLEGE, OXFORD, WITH THE FINANCIAL
SUPPORT OF THE DR. DANIEL JONES TRUST
PUBLISHED AT
MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD, ENGLAND

Editorial and Subscriptions at 13 Shrewsbury Road, Bolton, Lancs.

Sterling Area Annual Subscription 7/6. Single Copies 2/6,
by post 2/10. Remit to Editor at above address.

Dollar Area Annual Subscription \$1.50 Single Copies 50c

U.S.A. Remit to R. RAIBLE, 4015, Normandy, Dallas,
5, Texas, U.S.A.

Canada. Remit to R. McDONALD, 456 Argyle Avenue,
Westmount, P.Q., Canada.

*Editorial**Hour of Challenge*

WE enter upon the second decade of the life of this Journal with the first man-projected earth satellite still, literally, in the air. Never were moral integrity and calm reason more necessary in the guidance and control of man's earthly destiny than at this time. This is a sobering thought to check any latent nationalistic or ideological emotion about who were, or were not, first in the air with this new scientific device.

The greater the propaganda effect of the Russian feat upon the uneducated masses of the world, the greater is the challenge to moral responsibility now facing us.

It may, all too sadly, prove to be that the great religious institutions of the world will show themselves as powerless to assume the moral leadership of mankind as they have been hitherto in averting war.

With things as they are set at this time, the forces employing power for power's sake are driving mankind towards cataclysm. I remind you of the whole purport of the "Call to Freedom." Will no one break the circle of fear? There exists now, to-day, a situation calling for moral initiative and moral leadership of those, above all others, who have faith in man.

We believe that the moral leadership of mankind rests most squarely on the shoulders of men of free conscience whose faith in man is at least equal to their professed faith in God.

The words of L. P. Jacks, familiar to many of us on both sides of the Atlantic, may serve as a necessary reminder that this time of utter danger to mankind may not be redeemed except by calling upon the heroic quality in man.—"There is a dream of human progress which makes it to consist in a gradual easing of the lot of man until . . . the last peril is extinguished. . . . May it never come true! . . . Never is he more at home in the Universe than when he finds himself 'upon an engagement very difficult'. 'It behoves the Son of Man to suffer many things that he may enter into his glory'. Give him a life in which suffering plays no part and you defraud him of the core of his being. You say to him 'Be a hero no more'. The wise man turns from your offer with loathing."

If this is the hour of supreme challenge for men of liberal religion we should accept the finest leadership we possess. Albert Schweitzer has given us a lead based on reason and ethical insight. But cannot we have some leadership from our denominational headquarters in Boston and London? And cannot the Congress of the International Association for Religious Freedom, meeting in Chicago next August, rally the mind of the free world behind ethical insight and reason? If they could but persuade Dr. Schweitzer himself to come and further the high intention of his whole life we might yet help to turn the tide in favour of sanity and humanity. Preaching

weekly from our thousand pulpits of Freedom, Reason and Tolerance is good, but it is of little avail in a crisis where action is required directly on the minds and wills of those who wield political power.

We, who speak editorially, are but one man. We know that our movement is not organised for such action. But we believe that we must raise our voice, even though the heavens fall on us—as they are indeed, already falling with ‘a sickly dew,’ to distort and pervert the physical and mental health of generations to come.

If God wants anything done, he does it with human hands, so we should not prepare to wait while fear and folly, armed with greater power than ever before, wreak their insensate end upon mankind. At the moment I, like many more, can only raise a voice in the hope that, if man is to commit race suicide, we shall not be party to it by petrified inaction but shall die fighting for the divinity we know to be in man.

This is the challenge as I see it. First, a plan of action, such as the present leaders of our movement can best conceive. Second, the implementation of that action, for the which I dare to hope that we shall find both the will and the stamina ‘to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.’

Our Call to Freedom

There has been a sufficiently good response to “A Call to Freedom” to warrant the hope that the interest being engendered will result in action. Several Ministers’ Fraternal are arranging for its discussion and it is urged that every fraternal should consider making up its mind upon the “Call” during the next few months. It will largely depend upon the lead given by ministers whether the attempt to discover the mind of our movement on this great issue is pursued to the point of placing a well discussed resolution before the General Assembly next spring.

Ministers and Lay-preachers have already preached sermons upon it and the demand for the reprinted leaflet for discussion groups and congregational meetings has exhausted the first printing of several hundred copies. A further reprint will be made if the demand continues.

A letter from Mr. A. L. Blake, which we append, is typical of the keen interest shown by some of our laity. Amongst all the messages we received there was only one dissentient voice.

Albert Schweitzer’s “Appeal to Humanity”

We feel it most opportune that Dr. Schweitzer’s “Appeal,” originally broadcast from Oslo radio should be included in this first number of our eleventh volume. Ten years ago, in our first number, we published Dr. Schweitzer’s declaration of faith in Liberal Religion. We quote what he then wrote to the first post-war conference of the I.A.R.F., then meeting in Berne: “Only out of the renewal of ethical and religious thought can arise the spirit which gives to mankind the understanding and power to go from darkness

and struggle into light and peace. . . . May our free Christianity show itself able in spirit and in deed to fulfil its task in our time."

Dr. Schweitzer's "Appeal" gives most powerful support for the policy we have initiated in issuing the "Call to Freedom." It will naturally be read and discussed in all groups which are considering their response to the "Call."

Turning from the moral tension in the world at large to the tension within Liberal Religion, let us note some significant trend in the papers published in this issue.

A Reply to Mr. Morris

Some of Mr. Morris's criticisms were answered in our previous "Editorial." It is to be hoped that he, and those whom he represents, will find that the balance has been redressed. As for our own part in the discussion, we had no intention of evading any issue and feel that, in the past five numbers, we have delivered as many canny thrusts at the traditional theistic position as we have against the humanist attack. There is danger only in the uncompromising extremes of both positions. We still maintain that a humanism which passes from being affirmative about man into a denial of the validity of any idea of God, does not mediate the whole of a mature religion. But, then, I had something equally astringent to say about the weakness of a theism which stopped short at the First Commandment! Of course we change our definitions of God—because they are not, strictly speaking, definitions at all. And so, we are not going to be lured into making any definition of God which purports to be exhaustive or final. All one can do is to try to put into words the truths and insights which witness to our experience of spiritual reality in the world and in the lives of ordinary folk. Sometimes we may find no better words than "divine providence" and "grace." Sometimes we want to put our apprehensions in categories: truth, beauty and goodness, or courage, freedom and justice, or mercy, pity, peace and love. So we are for ever changing our mental picture of the divine reality, like Whitman in his *Song of Myself*:

"I hear and behold God in every object, yet understand God not in the least. . . .

I find letters from God dropt in the street, and every one is signed by God's name,

And I leave them where they are, for I know that whereso'er I go,

Others will punctually come for ever and ever."

We cannot define God, but we can affirm God. If I am asked what I mean by God I shall only confuse and mystify the questioner by theological subtleties. So I often take the words of Richard J. Hall,¹ in which even a child can find meaning:

1 Richard Hall died in 1930 as a result of taking food to unemployed miners' and tinsmith-workers' cottages through the mud and darkness of bitter winter nights. He was minister of the Unitarian Church at Swansea. His affirmation of God was made not only in these words but in his life and his death.

God is the goodness in all good deeds,
God is the succour in all our needs,
God is the wisdom in all wise words,
God is the sweetness of song in the birds,
God is the strength, helping all things weak,
God is the search for all who seek,
God is the light in the human eye,
God is the vastness beyond the sky,
God is the truth that for ever abides,
God is the power in the ocean's tides,
God is the love that enfolds the home,
God is the goal of those who roam,
God is the life in every leaf,
God is the comfort in every grief,
God is the justice forever sought,
Freely given, but never bought,
God is the mercy for those who err,
God is the daring of those who dare,
God is the rest that's in every night,
God is the glory revealed in the light,
God is endurance in every pain,
God is refreshment in falling rain,
God is the peace at the end of strife,
God is the meaning in every life,
God was, God is, God is to be,
God is in you, and God in me.

And so we call again—and the call is not a plaintive one—for affirmations of faith made by humanists and which correspond in a humanist's religious life to Richard Hall's affirmation of God. We want the most satisfying positive expressions of humanist faith.

It is still a matter of some puzzlement to me that, in the First Unitarian Church, Chicago, which Dr. Von Ogden Vogt conceived in soaring gothic and endowed with a truly catholic liturgical service, there was, some three years ago, a worshipping congregation, 46 per cent of which declared itself to be humanist. Did the word "humanist" in this case describe merely one way of approach to the spiritual reality experienced in worship, and the word "theist" another approach? I don't know. I should like to know, but I am not at all sure that the majority of those who chose to label themselves humanists could explain the satisfaction they evidently experienced in a beautiful liturgical service which was, in parts, more traditional and even archaic than is to be found in any Unitarian Church in the Old Country. With very few exceptions they seemed to respond in the act of worship to the spiritual apprehension of the Holy in the same way as the self-declared theists.

With Mr. Morris's championing of Emergent Evolution as the soundest interpretation of what is "given" in the phenomena of the natural world I agree, as also with his closing paragraphs.

Light on the Main Issue

Certain things are becoming clear through this debate. By careful discrimination of what they do most deeply believe some of our contributors who start out from a humanist position arrive at a point at which an understanding with spiritual theism seems not only possible but unavoidable. This is not a compromise but an approach by diverse paths to the same affirmation. What is more, it is found in the experience and meaning of worship where, all the time, we have been looking for it.

We point especially to two articles: that by Herbert Vetter in the Summer issue (No. 30) and that by Edward Ericson in this issue. They severally reject the God of classical theology and of cosmology but find God as a meaningful concept in the experience of spiritual reality.

Here is something positive. I suggest it is the clue to our theological dilemma. It is in the affirmation, which is also a sufficient definition, that "God is spirit," that we find unity already evident in the apprehension of theists and humanists worshipping together in our churches.

LETTERS

Practical Steps following "Call to Freedom"

From ARTHUR L. BLAKE, of Winscombe, Somerset.

I am impressed and cheered by the sincerity which has inspired a "Call to Freedom" and would be grateful if you would pass on the following comments to the authors, in the hope that the enthusiasm evoked by the Call will indeed develop into something enduring.

I think the key sentence is: "If nobody breaks the circle of fear we may drift into world dictatorship or world suicide." Surely then we must first "break" the fear among ourselves by way of example.

Granted that the renunciation of war is a necessary step towards the Kingdom of God on earth, yet to pass a resolution to "Renounce War" as an immediate objective would be like passing one to "Abolish Cancer." Practical steps must be indicated leading up to the agreed long-term aim.

Have the authors considered the reasons for the failure of the Treaty of Locarno, in which the principal nations of Europe, including Germany, agreed (amid international rejoicing) to "renounce war as an instrument of policy"? Any new initiative on these lines must surely lead up to a similar international agreement if it is to be effective, and what hope of survival would such an agreement have to-day, even though signed by all the members of U.N.O., unless the men of the Kremlin were willing at the same time to renounce publicly and sincerely the doctrine of Lenin about the destruction of democracy?

Concerning the term "War" I invite the authors to consider the view that between 1939 and 1945 Germany, Italy and Japan "made war" while the Allies took "police action" i.e. used force

to maintain law and order. Surely the spirit behind a course of action is of prime importance.

What steps can be taken to remove the present fear, remembering that one way of dealing with fear is to look it in the face?

To begin with, would not the sentence which I quoted above be still more explicit if it were to read: "People fear drifting into world dictatorship because of their still greater fear of world suicide (from the H-bomb) as the possible alternative?"

It is true that Britain would probably be the worst sufferer, but the term "world suicide" will not bear inspection as a glance at the globe will show. Do we then continue drifting towards dictatorship in the hope of escaping the Bomb, or do we refuse to give in to threats derived from the Bomb and take the consequences if necessary?

This seems to me the dilemma facing the free world and surely the first paragraph of the Call supports the more resolute alternative. By facing the threat courageously would we not break the circle of fear? God works in mysterious ways and sometimes very slowly. For all we know it may be His purpose that the world shall go through a "Dark Age" of dictatorship in order that His spirit may break through stronger and purer eventually. But we do not know this for certain and naturally hope that His spirit will break through our present darkness of fear and doubt, and surely we should work towards the more hopeful alternative.

Meanwhile there are signs that the forces of freedom are stirring in the dictator countries, especially among young people. Time is on our side provided we can keep the democratic areas of the world free and ready to help them.

Even at the cost of heavy human and material sacrifice?

I believe that each individual who values freedom should accept the possibility, but the acceptance must be free and unconstrained. No one has the right to force another to accept the possibility of Calvary, but I believe our forefathers would have accepted it in this case freely and without fear. I write as a Protestant Dissenter for ten generations including six as a Unitarian.

So I suggest that the proposed resolution might include an appeal to all political parties to unite in:

- (a) Standing firm at any cost against threats to freedom from any source.
 - (b) Sustaining the sense of freedom, at least of the mind and spirit, among the subjects of dictatorships. (B.B.C., etc.).
 - (d) Doing all possible to promote a form of federal government for Europe, in order to consolidate the areas devoted to democracy and as a step to reducing the rivalry between nations.
 - (d) Doing all possible to bring about reform in U.N.O. so that it may become an effective instrument for supervising international law and order and so eliminate the danger of war.
- Surely these are all practical steps in the right direction.

Expostulation

From JOHN M. MORRIS, of Quincy, Illinois

SEVERAL of the articles in the No. 29 issue of *Faith and Freedom* combined to give a one-sided appearance to the magazine. Everyone seemed to want to come to God's defence. Yet the editor's plaintive call for "Homocentric Affirmations," to balance a series of exclamations about God, suggests that he does not wish his journal to be as exclusive as that issue was.

It was painful reading. The authors were contented to assume humanism out of existence, when they should rather have been debating the very topics that they assumed.

At one point, for example, the Editor announces that "There is nothing wrong with religious humanism unless it claims to mediate the whole of a mature religion." But this is precisely what Humanism did claim. If the Editor is not willing to debate the matter, then further discussion is beside the point.

Again, Mr. Long asks, "If the humanists reject theism, what other explanation of the universe do they offer?" Unfortunately, he is phrasing the question in such a way as to assume the very point at issue, namely whether an "explanation of the universe" is possible. As his question stands, it is like the inquiry, "If you were not beating your wife, what woman were you beating?"

At one point, Mr. Long introduces a quotation from W. R. Matthews: "In the beginning was Space-Time; In the beginning was Thought; whichever of these two propositions we prefer to believe, no one could deny that the second was more intelligible." Intelligible to whom, may we ask? Does he think *no one* can deny it?

Perhaps the most upsetting passage, however, was the sentence of Mr. Long's that begins, "If we rule out emergent evolution. . . ." After some searching, I find that his reason for excluding the doctrine was its failure to explain the universe. Again, he was taking for granted an article that he should have been debating. Frankly, this just isn't fair. You can't win a debate by saying simply, "Let us rule out my opponent's position."

In brief, then, there seemed a tendency, shared by the Editor and Mr. Long, to make certain assumptions implicit in their arguments that should have been brought out into the open and defended explicitly.

It was sad, too, to see John H. Dietrich appearing as a witness for a position that he himself opposed on every possible occasion. He did indeed say, as the Editor says he did, ". . . if I can define the word myself, I believe in God. Humanism does not exclude the idea of God." The first sentence was spoken during an informal discussion at the First Unitarian Church of Berkeley, California, in 1952; the other appears in a sermon entitled "Humanism," delivered and published in Minneapolis about 1925. They appeared together in an editorial that I wrote once for the "Humanist World Digest."

They represent a long-continued, though minor, emphasis in Dr. Dietrich's religious philosophy. They should not, however, be separated from their context. Dr. Dietrich did distinguish Humanism from Atheism, "which actually denies the existence of any kind of God." But he went on to add, "Humanism simply ignores the idea of God, failing to see any evidence of intelligent purpose in the universe, which surely is the minimum basis of Theism. Its attitude is one of open-mindedness and inquiry, not of denial. However, its whole program is based on the assumption of an indifferent universe, of which man is a natural and unpurposed product, and in which he must by his own effort carve out his destiny."¹ In this context Dr. Dietrich's statements become merely his way of rejecting militant atheism; they are scarcely a compromise with theism.

I do not know what he would think of the Editor's definition of God as a "subjective reality" but imagine that he would be highly suspicious of it. And his suspicion would be justified. It is not too many paragraphs later that the Editor is quoting, in his own support, from an inscription by Von Ogden Vogt. But Vogt is one of the most outspoken opponents of the belief that God is a "subjective reality." Does the Editor change his definition of God as he goes along? Or is he trying to combine Dietrich and Vogt into a compromise position that both of them abhorred?

There has been a good deal of uneasiness about the humanist-theist controversy, and with good reason. The two positions are not really alternatives. A person might easily embrace neither of them, or, with a little trying, he might be both. They are both too loose, from a philosophical point of view. Humanism has been an uneasy coalition of positivists, pragmatists, materialists, pantheists, and followers of Bertrand Russell. Theism, on its side, includes every variety of Christian and Jewish orthodoxy, vitalists, pantheists, followers of A. N. Whitehead, and many other variations. With such dissimilar amalgams on either side, it is hardly strange that debates between the two parties have been confused.

Any claim, however, that the humanist-theist controversy is out of date seems a little premature. Perhaps it would be better to say that we all wish that the humanist-theist controversy were resolved to everyone's satisfaction. It does create problems for Unitarians. It requires, for instance, a good deal of thought and care to prepare a worship service for a congregation in which half the members believe in God and the other half do not. It requires a certain willingness, not only on the part of the minister but on the part of every member, to respect the right of each person to come to his own conclusion about the idea of God.

One of the unfortunate ways of settling our differences is the good-natured suggestion that we can define the word "God" in any way we choose. If this is legitimate, then one can scarcely avoid believing in him (or her or it). Although such a solution seems

¹ In *Humanism*, American Unitarian Association Pamphlet 337, 1934.

attractive (after all, there is a certain stigma attached to being an atheist) there are certain major objections to this procedure. For one, it drains all the meaning out of a perfectly good word. If everyone is encouraged to print his own money, then there can be no common medium of exchange. We can no longer say, "I believe in God," and expect anyone to know what we're talking about. The other objection is that it encourages a fuzzy kind of thinking. It permits one to define "God" in some plausible way and later to use the word as if the deity had all the attributes of the old theology. We would be permitted to say, for instance, that God is "the dimension of depth in human experience," but, when everybody had forgotten the definition, to speak to God in a way that is quite inappropriate for conversation with a Dimension.

However difficult we find the presence within our fellowship of absolute divergence upon theological issues, it does have a very important potentiality. It means that we must demand of our Unitarian church members that they come to terms with the important theological questions. They cannot be delegated to the minister or to the church for solution. There are no penalties for holding unusual views, if these are sincerely and intelligently held, in an open-minded and open-hearted spirit. One may even find oneself changing one's mind on basic issues. The minister may find himself changing from humanist to theist, or vice versa. Of course, such a church requires a high degree of tolerance and understanding on the part of every member of it. But it does hold the possibility of a new and better religion at a time when one is greatly needed.

A Plea for Creativeness in God Concept

From HENRY OZER of Brooklyn, New York

IN reviewing some of the articles in *Faith and Freedom*, especially those relating to the Theist-Humanist discussion I feel that an important point has been overlooked, namely: if there is a spiritual power in the cosmos can we attribute personality to that power?

In traditional theology is the anthropopsychic concept of the Supreme Power. He is pictured as a kind of magnified personality with thoughts, purposes, and passions like ourselves, though infinitely higher in scope; God is Divine Personality.

By emphasizing the psychic concept of personality religion has obscured the idea of a Supreme Power of Reality and shut itself off from an enlightened and growing section of the public who believe that the importance of reality outweighs the importance of a purely subjective concept. Besides, the concept of a subjective God of personality is often involved in difficulties and contradictions; as Goethe said:

As one is, so is his God.
Hence, so often God
becomes mockingly odd.

Unfortunately, too, the vulnerability of a concept of Divine Personality to scientific attacks involves such a religion in a grave danger. When the evidence is weighed against a God of personalism to show that he has no place in reality, it also leads to a disbelief in any idea of a Supreme Power, with the result that a very, very large proportion of the masses has lost faith in religion. The traditional church has done nothing to correct this situation because of its inflexible attitude. The church's position is that either God exists as a divine personality or he doesn't exist at all.

When the traditional church first attempted to rationalize God it faced the difficult question of proving how the subjective concept of personality could be projected into reality. Failing in this it found it necessary to separate God from nature and make God a supernatural being. Is it any wonder then, that the naturalists consider the universe from a strictly mechanistic viewpoint when religion itself has divorced the idea of a Supreme Power from nature?

Liberal religion is trying to develop a new viewpoint of the Divinity by conceiving God to be the immanent Spirit of the Cosmos instead of a supernatural being, but liberal religion still clings to the idea of personalism, feeling that if we take personality away from God we have nothing left to worship. The Theist argues as follows: Every human being who attempts to reflect upon the nature of God is forced to choose between two alternatives, a personal God, and a non-personal God. If a person tries to picture God as a personality he is more or less compelled to deify himself, to attribute to God his own thoughts and feelings. His God will then be simply a creation of himself, an anthropopsychic God whose existence, such as he conceives it to be, is highly improbable.

On the other hand if a person strives to consider God without a personality he removes every psychic quality such as love, pity, and anger, from the Divinity. But with the disappearance of each human attribute the figure of God grows paler and is gradually whittled down into nothingness. Religion cannot worship that of which it is ignorant, and so a non-personal God can be of no importance to religion.

It must be remembered, however, that religion deals mainly with the spiritual qualities of man and has always assumed that these qualities are the highest in the universe. But the philosopher, who deals with reason, assumes that reason, and not qualities of the spirit, is the highest thing in the universe. The scientist, who deals with the mechanical arrangement of things, assumes that mechanism is the highest principle of the universe, while the psychologist, he who deals with the subconscious mind, assumes that beliefs are a childish means of protecting the ego. From the viewpoint of the philosopher, the scientist or the psychologist, the theologian is arrogant and presumptive in assuming that the psychic qualities of man are the highest thing in the universe and, from their viewpoint, maybe they are right. They think to themselves, if religion

finds it necessary to believe that the Supreme Power must be regarded solely from the viewpoint of the spiritual powers of mass, then why should we, whose fields are outside the realm of spirit, give any consideration at all to the concept of God.

Going back into history we find that the classical proof for the existence of God, such as the cosmological, the teleological and the moral, did not arise with the theologians but were developed out of the philosophical enquiries of the Greeks. With but a few exceptions of mechanism, such as the schools of Democritus and Leucippus, these early Greeks concluded that a Supreme Power existed in the universe, but their concept was a rational one, that is, they attributed the quality of reason rather than the spiritual qualities of man, to the Supreme Power.

The Stoic religion for instance (and Stoicism was a religion) was based upon a concept of a Universal Reason that was an objective concept, not a subjective concept of personalism.

Going back still further we find that the Hindoo concept of Brahma, as originally conceived, before mysticism and idolatry took over, was a concept of a Universal Creating Power, eternal, infinite and all-pervading. At the stage of Brahmanas (a category of Vedic literature), Brahman was conceived as non-personal, and even to-day the liberal Indian philosophers do not ascribe personalism to the concept of Brahma.

Coming to the present day we find that the objection to the concept of God arises more from an objection to personalism than from disbelief in a universal spiritual power.

Einstein's idea of God is based upon a view of the rational character of reality. He was not a disbeliever, for he speaks of trying humbly to comprehend even an infinitesimal part of the intelligence manifested in nature, but he was also anxious to avoid attributing any personalism to that cosmic intelligence. In fact he was quite definite about it, saying that "In their struggle for ethical good, teachers of religion must have the stature to give up the doctrine of a personal God."

David Starr Jordon, one time Chancellor of Stanford University, voices an opinion similar to that of Einstein. Jordon writes: "The infinite expanse of the universe, its growth through immeasurable periods of time, the boundless range of its changes and the rational order that pervades it, all seem to demand an infinite intelligence behind its manifestations." In another statement, however, Jordon rejects personalism by saying: "The traits often assigned to Deity, the qualities of personality, of love, of wrath, properly belong only to poetry and symbolism. Even in imagination we cannot expand any human trait to infinity."

In the place of personalism there seems to be growing a consciousness that the highest attribute of the divinity is the attribute of creativeness. To this attribute can be assigned eternal significance, spirituality and all-inclusiveness. It accounts for the principle of

mechanism as well as the principles of evolution and purpose and therefore offers a rational and satisfactory explanation of the universe as well as providing the essential basis for a religious life. Furthermore it is the primary concept from which all of the various concepts of the divinity originated. The Egyptian Sun-god, *Ra*, the Persian God, *Ormazd*, the Chinese concept of *Yang* and *Yin*, the Greek concept of *Chronos*, and the American Indian concept of *Manitou*, all were originally concepts of a creating power and even *Yahveh* was originally thought of as the Creator of all things.

Professor Herrick, a humanist with a mechanistic outlook, concedes that the "universe is dynamic and intrinsically creative at all levels of organization," and in a review of Dr. Halbert Dunn's book, *Your World and Mine* (May-June issue of *The Humanist*) Professor Herrick emphasizes Dr. Dunn's opinion that "our physical universe is intrinsically creative and this creativity reaches its highest level, so far as we know, in human intelligence."

John H. Hershey, a Unitarian Minister of Bridgewater, Mass., and an author of *South America's Philosophy and Sociology*, says of creativeness: "The universe or cosmos is basically creative and man, with all his qualities, is part of, and participates in, that creativeness. With his evolved powers, man can carry forward the work of creation by laboring to achieve a peaceful and co-operative world, industrial democracy, racial brotherhood, arts, moral character and other aspects of the human spirit. Such a religion of creativeness gives us a magnificent purpose by which to live, since it relates us to human society and to the cosmos."

In *Society and Knowledge*, the English writer V. G. Childe also refers to the cosmos as creativity. On page 129 he writes: "Reality is a creative activity of process. You may call this principle of reality, spirit, if you mean thereby the essence of creative activity. In this process each individual though but a part can yet contribute and thus can actively participate in creation itself."

One more example of this new trend toward the concept of creativeness. Prof. Edmund W. Sinnott, eminent biologist and Dean Emeritus of the Graduate School of Science, Yale University, writes in his latest book, *Matter, Mind and Man* (page 217): "Is not life itself, at least to a degree, creative? Does not man thus share in the creativeness of nature, not as a puppet, helplessly enmeshed in the rigid certainties of inevitable physical laws but as part of the cosmic creative process itself? And more than this has not man immense possibilities for spiritual growth? Of all creatures man alone has the possibility to glimpse what lies ahead of him. In him life's aspiration has risen past the goals of the body to strive to reach that spiritual core (creative spirit) from which the universe takes form."

May I conclude by humbly suggesting that the concept of personalism need not necessarily be a final one for religion and that the future may well see the principle of creativeness as an important contribution to man's concept of God.

The God of Worship

F. J. HAMBLIN*

WHEN conducting a service for the worship of God, a minister often uses words which imply that he is addressing a Being who is aware of, and in some way responsive to those words; a Being to whom is attributed a capacity for thought, feeling and purpose, which are regarded as distinctively personal activities. We have indeed no experience of them as existing apart from personality, and the God of worship must, accordingly, include something that corresponds to personality in man. From this there arises the central problem of the theistic Unitarian movement, regarded as a worshipping community, for it is in public worship that a divine personality is assumed.

As a private individual, I can, and often do, accept my spiritual experience as valid in itself, and feel no need to refer it to any actual conception of God. As an officiating minister, always liable to be asked, and sometimes asking myself, "To what God do you address these words?" I ought to have an answer, a conception of God in which I fully believe, a conception which I can maintain against the objections of a modern mind, and, lest the God of my reasoned thought should be other than the God of my spoken words of worship, a conception that includes personality.

I am thus committed to a quest for divine personality. It is a personal quest and I speak personally. When I indicate the direction in which I have been seeking, I do not expect that others will accompany me all the way along the same road. My object is to stimulate the search and I wish to say quite plainly that I regard the statement of the problem and of its bearings on the present situation far more important than my own gropings.

In saying that my conception of God must include something that answers to personality in man, I have been careful not to define God as a Person. I am not trying to put Infinity into a nutshell. Our deepest thoughts and experiences of the divine are not easily brought within a personal conception. There is, for example, the view maintained by MacDougall: "That all life is one, that all living creatures are but twigs upon one single tree of life through which runs one common stream, a stream of purposive activity; and since, in man, this stream rises to the level of spiritual activity, we may infer that the common stream is one of spiritual activity also."

This imagery of the single tree of life and the common stream of spiritual activity is helpful in private meditation. It comes near to combining the God "in whom we live and move and have our being" and "the indwelling God, proclaimed of old." The idea of

* Personal note on page 32.

God as both around us and within or, in a more universal sense, both immanent and transcendent, is necessary to my complete thought of him. If my conception of personality cannot include this, it must at least allow for it.

I must not be regardless, either, of the spiritual values. "The best that I know or can think of," is, to some, all that they need or, indeed, can know of God. God is love, and whatever picture I may form must not exclude that.

To withstand the assaults of a modern mind my conception must have a certain robust quality, meeting and not evading the difficulties that may be presented in the way of believing in a personal or, indeed, any God at all. I dismiss as irrelevant any argument from the mere size of the Universe. This serves only as a pointer; the God I conceive must not be less than the Spirit of the Universe. He may well be more. He must not be less. Traditional orthodoxy, as Dean Inge complained, is geocentric. Atheistic humanism is even narrower in its scope. In this expanding universe the attempt to relate all values to human experience alone does not strike me as being particularly scientific. The Spirit of Humanity *might be*, I do not say *is*, the spirit of some parts of the earth's surface. It cannot be the Spirit of the Universe, unless it is included within, and is, in some way, a part of a universal spirit.

Atheistic or scientific humanism does not challenge me at all; but if it is not a challenge it may be a symptom—an indication that modern theism lacks a conception of God that is acceptable to minds having or, should I say, professing a scientific bias.

We have now reached the first of two points that indicate the importance of our problem. Unitarianism is exposed, as a movement, to erosion by the humanists and unless we are capable of saying more definitely *what* or *whom* we mean when we say God, that erosion will continue. There is a difficulty which hardly existed until recently, which operates unconsciously and is not so much a ground for rejection of, as the cause of a revulsion from, current conceptions of Deity, and especially a Unitarian conception.

The difficulty is that our direct knowledge of personality is of human personality; all conceptions of divine personality are necessarily, in some way, extensions of human personality. In any time or place an acceptable conception of God is related to the current conception of man. This is obviously and even physically true of the anthropomorphic gods, the *Yahweh* of some parts of the Old Testament and the God of many a Christian to this day. As thought and knowledge advance, the physical attributes of the god are discarded; and when God comes to be identified with goodness and the flesh with evil, what remains is but a vaguely conceived disembodied consciousness.

I do not say that we think of God in that way; but many in our congregations would do so if they were pressed to formulate their beliefs; and we ourselves might find difficulty in expounding a

personal God otherwise than in terms of consciousness—a conception that can only satisfy when personality and consciousness are taken as practically identical. But nowadays while there may be differences concerning the relationship between the conscious and the unconscious in the total personality, there is no dispute about the importance of the depths of personality.

In speaking of a disembodied consciousness I have deliberately chosen an expression to denote the process by which the physical frame of an anthropomorphic god was shed and the resulting deity appeared as an immaterial spirit—an infinitely enlarged and perfected consciousness, an infinite extension of only a part, the surface of human personality; the part which is readily perceived in introspection.

A God so conceived does not respond to, and elicits no response from the depths of our being. But it is a conception that is implied by our ordinary language of worship, which may therefore leave the would-be worshipper unsatisfied. Atheistic humanism, as I see it, springs from this sense of dissatisfaction and is an attempt to find satisfaction in the depths of one's own being and the social sense of mankind.

If we are subject to erosion by humanism we also suffer attrition by orthodoxy. Children of Unitarians, knowing what we stand for, sometimes find in another church the satisfaction which we have not given them. I suggest that the Trinity holds something which appeals more deeply to their sense of personality than does the somewhat abstract divine consciousness that is apt to be presented to them in Unitarian worship. There are depths and inter-relations in divine personality—the Father, the transcendent source of all being; the Son, perfectly divine yet holding all the fulness of man's nature; the Holy Ghost, the pervasive spirit who is the fountain of inward inspiration. An instructed orthodox person can expound his deepest beliefs in terms that include his ordinary language of worship. We, on the other hand, worship in personal terms and expound in terms that are largely impersonal. I am far from recommending orthodoxy, but psychologically it has us at a disadvantage; a fact which we ignore at our peril. We must either find a new vocabulary of worship, which might appeal only to people addicted to abstract thinking, or else find a conception of divine personality that shall have both unity and depth.

I start my quest by asking what I mean by personality or a person; and the one thing that seems to me essential is *awareness*. Consciousness is that aspect of awareness which is directed to the here and now of space and time. I am aware of much that is not included in my present consciousness. I know certain facts and hold certain opinions of which I am not at the moment conscious, but I can bring them to mind. This awareness of my knowledge and beliefs includes all periods of my consciousness of them but it is more extensive. When I state, as a present fact, that I am aware of something, it is a statement of continuing fact, not limited to the

particular periods when I have this information in mind. Further, there is the repressed or forgotten matter which influences my behaviour but may not be available to my consciousness unless some psychotherapist helps me break down the barrier and consciously discover something that I have unconsciously known all along. Apart from the things that have been in my conscious life but have been repressed or forgotten, there may be items of awareness that have never penetrated the consciousness at all. Further, our deep awareness is not merely a storehouse of static material or a prison house of turbulent emotions, it also holds a capacity for thinking, as when we sleep on a problem and wake to find it solved. I would not exclude a deep unconscious awareness of the present situation.

If I define a person as "one who is aware," I am already describing something that goes deeper than a conscious self and is also more enduring. My self-awareness, by virtue of which I *am* the person who did this or that twenty years ago, is not a transitory experience like self-consciousness, but a state of being enduring, as one present fact, so long as I live. My conception of the God who thinks and feels, knows and wills, must be related to awareness rather than consciousness; and this consideration will gain increasing importance as I proceed on my quest.

The line of search is laid down for me by the requirement that the conception shall be acceptable to a mind having, or professing, a scientific bias. My point of approach is the physical nature of a living organism.

Biologists regard the cell both as the origin and the unit of life. Our own bodies consist of many millions, the most primitive organisms of only one cell. A cell multiplies by dividing, producing either separate individuals or members of a colony of similar cells or, by a process of differentiation, specialisation and organisation, growing into the elaborate structure of a plant or animal. The origin of species and the birth of an individual follow the same course. In the present state of knowledge there is no clear distinction between the smallest living organisms and matter that is commonly regarded as lifeless. It has often been said, and sometimes very loudly, that the whole process of the origin and development of life can be explained by Evolution, with no need for a God at all.

Evolution is a word that labours under a monstrous deal of potted thinking. As Emergent Evolution, with two initial capitals, it sounds weighty enough to flatten the whole of theology; but in fact it conveys no meaning that is not also included in the term, continuing creation. The important question does not refer to the fact of evolution or change, but whether it is random or purposive.

A great part of the evolutionary process is explicable on the hypothesis that great numbers of variations and mutations have occurred at random, as mutations do in fact often appear to occur; and that by natural selection and survival of the fittest those changes

which proved favourable were reproduced, while creatures worse equipped perished. Yet there are some factors that seem to require a purposive explanation. Some of the parts of the higher organisms are so highly specialised in their structure and require so elaborate a structure before they will function at all, that it is difficult to imagine their emergence in a random process. Of this the eye may be taken as an example.

The "random" exposition is that certain creatures once had nerve-ends that were sensitive to light, just as we have nerve-ends that are sensitive to heat. They are presumed to have felt light in some such way as we feel heat. To be especially sensitive to light was an advantage in the struggle for survival; variations that made the individual more sensitive were favourable and therefore survived. Thus, by a series of favourable mutations the eye was evolved.

The eye is, however, an elaborate organ. It will not function as an eye at all unless there is a lens to bring the light rays to a focus; a retina, at a distance appropriate to the focal length of the lens to receive the image; and an elaborate system of nerves to register and communicate the vision. I mention only the barest essentials.

Between the simple nerve-end that is sensitive to light and the most primitive optical organ that is a real eye there is a long range of evolution, a gathering and shaping of materials that required many mutations, all in the same direction. Without professing to be a biologist I understand that a great part of this process was of no conceivable advantage to the individuals in whom it took place. It is possible to argue this away but this involves making vast assumptions—such as "linking" useless optical mutations with useful mutations affecting some other (unknown) part of the body, so that the eye was an accidental by-product of the evolution of the lungs, liver or what not! In the present state of knowledge it seems easier to agree that there was some over-riding purpose, that these still sightless creatures should have descendants which could see, an understanding of how it could be done, and an activity that assembled and shaped the materials for the purpose. Where the purpose and understanding reside and what is the source of the activity, I will leave for the moment. I must return to the cell.

Just as all life originates in a single cell, so in a complex organism each single cell remains a life. This is so important to my argument that I will repeat it in different words; every cell has a life of its own, independent of whatever life it may share with other cells or the life of the whole body. Each cell is a living entity in itself. The cells of my body depend on me for warmth, oxygenation and nourishment, they play their part in my physical and mental activity, yet to some extent they live independently of me; they will not necessarily die simultaneously with my death. Indeed they can be kept alive, apart from my body, in a nutrient fluid. "The descendants of a piece of heart muscle dug out of a hatching hen's egg are still under observation though the original tissue was abstracted

some thirty years ago," wrote V. H. Mottram.

The important question now arises: What is the relation of my life to the fifteen thousand million cellular lives within my body? My self-awareness is single; I do not accept it as a confederation of millions of whatever dim awareness may belong to one cell. Yet my life is certainly related to all these lives; in some way it includes them, in some way directs them, in some way depends on them; yet in another way it transcends them, especially in my mental and spiritual experience. From the viewpoint of a body cell, assuming it to have one, it depends on me for nutriment and warmth, which are, however, conditional on its continuing to serve my purpose; it is in a real sense a part of me and I enter into it, yet it retains some separate and individual existence.

I can thus make an addition to my view of human personality: I can think of it as a life that in some way embraces many other lives, with which nevertheless it cannot be entirely identified. Between the life and the lives there must be some degree of mutual awareness and mutual concern. I am wondering whether this relation between the life of, and the lives within, a living organism may not be a little picture, true in so far as it goes, of the life *of* and the life *in* God; whether, in particular, the mutual awareness and the mutual concern which I have postulated on so small a scale can fairly be extended to the knowledge and love of God, also reciprocal, which is the primary concern of religion. I must enquire further.

But first I wish to notice two points that are relevant to my final conclusions, but will not otherwise figure in my discussion. First: in the building up of the various organs and members of a body the cells form themselves into communities or co-operative societies, which may function well or badly. Second: the mutual concern between the life and the lives is not automatically perfect. It is possible for a cell, or number of cells, to proclaim their independence of the organism which nourishes them, to increase and multiply without regard for the life of the whole, to be inimical to it and so in the end to be self-destructive, having cut off their own supply of nutriment.

The question remains: Am I justified in imputing awareness, of the faintest and vaguest kind, to the single cell? The answer is that awareness appears to be traceable a great deal further back than that.

Since 1935, when it was discovered that certain viruses, regarded as living organisms, were single molecules of a protein, there has been no clear distinction between living and lifeless matter. This frees us from any need to postulate emergence or special creation of life in a universe that had previously been devoid of it. Nor need I look for an interfering God—which, by the way, is the only kind of god that seems to be contemplated by atheists, who seem impervious to the idea of a Being who expresses himself in the very nature of things.

"It is the electron that is the key of the universe," writes J. W. N. Sullivan, who also says "In the motions of individual atoms and electrons there seems to be an element of free-will." He also quotes Eddington as saying, "that something analogous to free-will must be put at the basis of all physical phenomena." Jeans's view is well known; that the electron appears to be of the nature of a thought. If it is objected that Jeans and Eddington, and Sullivan also, wrote with a religious bias, this certainly is not so of Bertrand Russell who wrote in a recent article¹ "I believe a living brain to be composed of thoughts and feelings, those very thoughts and feelings which we observe in ourselves." Elsewhere² he relates this thought definitely to the electron. Writing of the human brain he says, "But while its owner was alive, part, at least, of the contents of his brain consisted of percepts, thoughts and feelings. Since his brain consisted also of electrons, we are compelled to conclude that an electron is a grouping of events, and that if the electron is in a human brain, some of the events composing it are likely to be some of the 'mental states' of the man to whom the brain belongs."

Free-will, thought and feeling are all elements of what I call awareness. A percept, or part of a 'mental state' is to me awareness itself. It is not necessary for my purpose that there should be agreement about how they compose, or are at the basis of, the physical world; for I am not trying to prove my faith by science but rather to conceive an imaginative picture that shall be acceptable to a mind professing a scientific bias. It is enough for me that a scientist would not necessarily reject it; indeed some scientists (including a professing agnostic) apparently envisage a universe that is occupied by a vast number of tiny centres of awareness. I find it hard to imagine that each of these innumerable units of awareness should be separately self-existent in its own right. I need to suppose some pervading awareness which comprehends them all with, perhaps, already some mutual awareness. I am considering indeed, as existing between God and the electron, the same kind of relation that I have already contemplated as existing between me and my body cells—only vastly extended in both directions.

These infinitesimal entities have a tendency or capacity for entering into structural or organic relationships which constitute larger entities—atoms, molecules of increasing complexity until we reach the large molecules which are on the fringe of recognisable life. The smallest living organism, with its power of seeking, accepting or rejecting foodstuff, is the point at which something that I can really imagine as awareness enters the picture. But it is already a complex of smaller centres of awareness. Its awareness, dim and vague and fragmentary as I must regard it, is already a *top* awareness; awareness already has *depth*.

¹ *Sunday Times*, Jan. 13, 1957.

² *Analysis of Matter*, quoted by Eddington in *The Nature of the Physical World* (1944 edn.), p. 277.

At any stage of evolution it is difficult to conceive how the top awareness has arrived without the exercise of some directing awareness working creatively. And, as I have suggested with regard to the eye, there are points at which it seems necessary to presume such a creative awareness, who by guiding such little awarenesses into larger and more complex ones, is thus expressing himself in time and space. Moreover, the evolutionary advances made within the living creatures must be, to some extent, their own work, showing a capacity to co-operate in a purpose that is beyond themselves.

The more complex a structure, whether mental or physical, the more room is there for points of difference from other similar structures to increase and multiply. Individuality becomes more apparent and more significant. And I now come to something that is to me rather important: namely, myself. Where do I come in?

When a single cell began that process of division and organisation that resulted in my body, what was produced was not simply a unit of the human species, displaying only those characteristics that are common to all mankind, but an individual with idiosyncrasies; in short, me. I am entitled to ask what determined the development of this particular individual. The biologist will tell me of chromosomes and genes, and I will concede that they have determined many characteristics of body, mind and behaviour. I will agree that they, with various other influences during my life, have largely determined what I am like, but not what I *am*. I do not accept that any mechanistic or other external process determined the awareness which is my most certain individual possession.

I cannot fix a moment when I entered into an organism which had previously been developing without me. I must, it appears, have been present from the very beginning, or not at all. Within a certain framework laid down by my ancestry, within certain limitations of material and ability, with a known liability to make mistakes, I directed the formation of my physical frame—"I" being regarded as a creative awareness expressing itself in space and time as my body; a very restricted and imperfect process, yet in kind essentially similar to that which the creative awareness of God expresses itself in the whole physical universe.

My conception of God is thus of a Being whose relation to me is similar to my relation to one of my body cells; whose relation to the two thousand million people now living is similar to my relation to the fifteen thousand million cells. This relation involves mutual awareness and mutual concern between the greater and the less; and a greater creative awareness expressing itself in the less. Through this mutual awareness and concern, operating creatively, I can claim kinship with God, which I am free to symbolize in the Father-child relationship. I find this kind of conception satisfying in a variety of ways which I will now proceed to indicate.

It involves no theoretical consideration of Infinity, Omniscience,

Omnipotence and the like, in which the human mind is liable to get lost in bewilderment and to be left wondering whether it believes anything at all.

It leaves room, as was indicated by my mention of cancer-cells, for the deliberate repudiation of the mutual awareness and concern, *i.e.* deliberate denial of, and resistance to, God, shading down to varying degrees of neglect and apathy. In the perfectly healthy body, each cell must apparently love its neighbour as itself. Again, as the body-cells enter into communities within the body, forming the various organs and members, with certain individuals (nerve-cells) having very special responsibilities, there seems to be among them some mutual obligation, social concern and devotion to the common good. Moreover, since in the purposive aspect of evolution, there appears to be, in the lesser units of awareness, a fruitful capacity for co-operating in purposes beyond their reach, I can relate this to our endeavours after the Kingdom of God with an assurance that they are not necessarily futile.

By linking awareness with physical structure we find ourselves in sympathy with the psychosomatic conception of human personality, the importance of which is becoming increasingly appreciated.

To the thought of mutual awareness and mutual concern between God and man, as between man and cell, I can relate various features of my religious experience. Awareness is a term that defies definition, for, since it includes avowedly unconscious elements, it probably cannot be defined in the vocabulary of consciousness. We do, however, recognise it, and I think we can all see it as conceivably existing in more partial and vague forms than the consciousness which we see as a function of a whole person. We can also, I think, without difficulty, conceive its extension above or beyond consciousness—in either case, without violating our fundamental notion of awareness. A single cell, say in my big toe, can have but the vaguest awareness of *me*. It cannot be supposed to know anything of my intellectual interests, taste in literature or political opinions, still less of any aspect of my life that transcends time and space. This consideration must, of course, operate upwards from me as well as downwards. I cannot expect to know much about God, but if my natural relation with him is one of mutual awareness, then I can directly know those aspects of him that come within my scope. My inward intimations of the divine can be valid. In themselves, as I experience them, they are more important than any interpretation I may place upon them. By rationalisation I may pervert or even destroy them. Yet I must examine them if only to determine whether they come from a level below or above that of my conscious awareness. My sense of the Divine presence may, at times, be taken as a heightening of my own awareness, and, at higher levels, the experiences of mysticism and inspiration may be taken as instances of its mutuality.

Self-awareness, the awareness of being aware, is a function of a being having what we term a spiritual life; one able to engage knowingly in intellectual adventure, moral endeavour and a striving after the values of goodness, truth and beauty. This ability is only reached, so far as we know, at an advanced stage of physical evolution—a nearer approach to the supreme awareness of the divine personality. I must therefore expect an intensification of awareness as I look upwards. I need not suppose that God's awareness of me is as dim and unconscious as my awareness of the components of my own personality. Rather it may be asserted that he will know more definitely and certainly than I can know; and what I have described as mutual concern must be exalted with greater understanding and greater intensity and a more intimate tender concern in the love of God. But it remains a mutual concern, with an obligation resting on me.

Worship, as it is described by religious liberals, often appears like a kind of one-way traffic, which need be hardly more than an exercise in auto-suggestion. I see it rather as an endeavour to maintain, extend and, where needed, restore, the mutual awareness between worshipper and God; of which the mutuality is apt to become weakened on the human side. An act of worship is an exercise of the conscious self to maintain a harmony that exists, to restore a harmony that has been broken, to achieve a harmony that had not yet been reached. In that harmony both heights and depths of being are involved. We cannot say that God is not aware of the present situation, a situation that includes our own words and thoughts. His awareness may not be, probably is not, in the form that we call consciousness, but a conscious self, addressing itself to God in thoughts and words, must, by its very limitations, address itself *as if* to another consciousness. The *as if* is important; so long as we have this in mind our normal method of worship is justified in the same way as we are justified, in ordinary speech, in speaking of sunrise and sunset.

In conclusion, let me say that what I have been striving to express is not a proof, not an argument, not an analogy, but a conception. A conception is something that I can conceive; and a reasonable conception is one that I think *may* be true. I make no higher claim. Of one thing I am certain; many people find in the very idea of God a certain unreality due to their inability to form a reasonable conception of him. I chose to seek a conception based on the supposed points of greatest difficulty for religious belief: evolution and the cellular structure of life. I have been greatly surprised, as an ordinary working minister without special qualifications, to find a conception growing that did in fact satisfy me in many particulars. I should like to see those who are better equipped than I am engage in the same adventure. Theirs will be a different starting point and they will follow a different road, but maybe we shall find ourselves converging on the same goal.

Is God Necessary?

The God of Cosmology?—No!

The God Who is Spirit?—Yes!

EDWARD ERICSON

I BELIEVE that religion is a human invention, and one which may prove to be at least as useful as the electric light. I believe that the gods are human inventions—the God of Christian and Jew no less than the gods of Hottentots. I believe the values, the morals and sanctions of society, the ideals by which we live, are human inventions. I believe that religion, in every phase and form, is of human origin and design, and must be weighed in the scales of human well-being. As a vessel shaped for human purposes, religion can be useful—like the shoe-horn. It may be indispensable—like the post office; at least it is subject to improvement and modification, perhaps like the ball-point pen. But until man understands the importance of providing himself with his own source of light, he is condemned to spend his days as a spiritual bulb-snatcher.

In calling religion a human invention I think that we enhance and extend its value. If it were other than human we could possibly discount it. Likewise, if the gods were beings of independent existence we could conceivably ignore them; but since they spring from the brow of mankind, as the children of our image-making, we must take them into account. They are the products of our aspiration just as surely as carbon dioxide is the product of our respiration. We do not choose to be religious. Religion is inevitable. We choose among kinds of religion.

It is difficult to reduce one's religious philosophy to a single paper, and it is necessary, for the sake of brevity, to do more labelling than I should prefer. On the other hand, I am not afraid of a useful label and willing to take advantage of my youth and immaturity to have a few recognizable ideas.

In spite of the peril of short definitions, if I were asked to describe my faith in a few formal adjectives I would reply that my outlook on man and the universe can be described as naturalistic, deterministic, and humanistic. I do not find it necessary or helpful to employ any degree of supernaturalism or any degree of what passes for theism in my understanding of the natural world. On the other hand I believe that the concept of God (purely as a religious concept in the realm of values) has a legitimate place in religion, although I do not think it is a necessary one for all people. God as a cosmological hypothesis seems to me to be meaningless and superfluous, but the spiritual concept of the idea of God is another matter.

Let me explain what I do *not* believe about God so that it may be clear what I do believe. In simple words, the proposition that the

universe was created by a divine agency transcending it, gives us no help or information in understanding the universe which we do not have already by purely human, empirical observation. It offers a mystery as an explanation of another mystery, and a mystery cannot be an explanation.

In so far as the divine-creator hypothesis seems to explain an alleged event in the empirical world, I submit that it is not substantially a religious concept but a quasi-scientific hypothesis in religious garb. As a scientific hypothesis I believe that it is of very questionable validity. The contention that the universe had to have a creator is like the old story that Atlas has to support the earth. I can see no more merit in a God at the beginning of time than a stop sign at the end of space. Is it not ridiculous to think we are talking meaningfully when we talk about the beginning of time?

It is just as easy to postulate the self-sufficiency of a natural world as to postulate the sufficiency of a super-nature beyond nature. To argue that nature is too wonderful to be self-existent is no different than to say that God must be less wonderful if God were self-sufficient.

To put it in more abstract form. To say that *X* requires *Y* to create *X*, while *Y* needs no creation precisely because it is *Y*, is to indulge in a reckless display of word magic. And word magic I believe it is. For when the neutral symbol *Y* is substituted for the emotion-laden symbol "God," a proposition which many of us have been taught to consider self-evident makes no sense whatever.

I hold that the existence of nature demands no explanation. No meaningful explanation is possible. As observers on the inside of a closed system, we can observe events only within that system relative to other events in the system. To treat the system itself as a measurable event is to put ourselves in the spot of the remarkable fellow who was strong enough to lift himself by his own boot-strings. (Theologians of course have been doing that for centuries—even liberal theologians. But I don't think they have broken any necks by high falling!)

Neither do I believe in God as a kind of miracle, cement filling up the cracks and crevices of a rigid mechanical universe. If the universe were an inert mechanical mass, then surely it must have derived its *élan vital* from some divine push. But I see every reason to believe that we do not live in that kind of universe. So, in calling myself a naturalist I am not willing to use God as a mechanism to explain what I cannot otherwise explain in terms of my understanding of nature. I do not assume that nature is an inert clay which awaits the hand of a celestial potter.

But I am a naturalist in the other sense, that I reject the supernatural origin of religion with its theories of messiahs and prophets of God and their many claims of revelation and divine sanction. (I would consider the claims of intuition as only the poor country-cousin of the ancient proposition of divine and supernatural truth.

Much can be said in analysing what intuition is, but the uncritical acceptance of intuition is a great stumbling block to clear thinking).

I believe in natural religion; that religion develops spontaneously and inevitably in response to human needs. Religion is created by man for man. His hopes, his dreams, his fears, his hatreds, his lack of idealism, his demotic ideals, as much as his divine ideals.

When our ancestors first stood upright and looked upon the face of Mother Earth they found themselves a weak and lonely people, who would have perished but for the face of Mother Earth. But Mother Earth did have a face. The features of Astarte, Diana, Aphrodite, and Osiris are but the flickering memories of a cave-boy's cry for the old Earth parent. Man has always seen beings like himself projected in the Universe about him. Humanity for the most part has not been willing to believe that he is entirely alone.

When the sluggish mind of the first rational man rose like a dim lamp from the eternal black ooze of the unknowing, that mind began its ageless quest for life similar to itself. Every reflection of its flicker has served to spur it on to that hypnotic hunt which never traps its quarry and never ends its chase. It is an endless game, an earnest game played by candlelight in a darkened hall of many mirrors. Man is an ideal-producing animal. Through countless centuries he has wanted to believe that the silence shares his vision. He has shouted forth his litanies through the canyons of time for the assurance gleaned from an echo. And even when the echo has failed he has sung his own responses.

The gods and goddesses have come, have answered to the music of flute and harp, have comforted their worshippers and then have withdrawn to the mountains of the North without sigh or whisper, impelled by the rising and falling notes of human musicians.

We read, for example, in the Apocalypse of the New Testament: "Then I [John] saw a new heaven and new earth. For the first heaven and the first earth had passed away and the sea was no more. And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." Such was the new heaven and new earth described by St. John on Patmos nearly nineteen centuries ago. The heavens and new earths seen by men are countless as the sands of the sea. But it would seem dreams die quickly. As the grave robber says in the film *The Egyptian*, "Only the little grains of sand live forever." Yet how little the grave robber may have known. When the grain of sand is worn away it leaves no progeny. The sun's sparkle in the prisms of its crystal are forever lost. But the dream, which is more delicate, more precious, is also more lasting. It is a possession which does not spoil with age, but is handed down from father to son for countless ages, through many generations. Dreams do not die. At most a weary dream will only sleep. When it is neglected it will punish its despoiler, when it is rejected it will appear in a new form, disguised in the anonymity of a hidden symbolism.

Man is an ideal-producing animal whose exile on Patmos is always before him. The revelations of Patmos are perpetual. As long as man is a man he will look for a new heaven and a new earth. He will pursue that hunt which never traps its quarry and never ends its chase.

What is this thing we call religion, and why do we think about it at all? The religious conservative will ask, "have I not admitted too much already?" For if I conceive the Universe as indifferent to human purposes, and if I allow that God and Heaven are made of the stuff of dreams, then is my religion not a mockery and I the most miserable of men?

I would think not, because I hold that the dream is the most important element of the man. It is the dream which distinguishes the man from the clod from which he came. When we can no longer contain a dream, a religion, our mouths are stuffed with dust.

To say that religion is a human invention and that God is an angel of the mind is not to conclude that we must put both religion and God away. I think it a terrible indictment of our opinions of ourselves that we so often consider our ideals discredited when we discover their genesis in our own nature.

I believe that the only God that man can know is in man himself. I believe that the only purposes that man can fathom are human purposes. I see no purpose in the natural order. I see no evolution to a final and positive goal. (Yes, to be sure, life has evolved to complex form. But when we look upon our universe, and we see things come and things go, it seems to me that this is merely a matter of ethics. Progress is ethical. It reverses its direction). To project cosmic purposes on human dreams, it seems to me is a most dangerous game. But to my mind there is nothing negative in this faith. Maybe it is a bit Spartan at first, but I believe that it holds a gospel as complete and rich as any. The spiritual opposite of a positive supernaturalism is not a negative atheism but a positive faith in the self-made destiny of men. It is a different vision, perhaps, but none the less a vision of religious proportions.

When our Unitarian forebears departed from an orthodox faith in the Trinity they gave to Jesus a human status. They deified God the Father alone and then tended to forget the Holy Spirit entirely. To my mind, God the Father presents just about as many logical difficulties to belief as God the Son. I did not become a Unitarian because I doubted the virgin birth, or the infallibility of scripture. There are many people in orthodox churches, including the intelligent clergy, who also do not believe those things. I became a Unitarian because my disbelief, my questioning of the whole approach to religion by orthodox theism, is much more fundamental and pierces to the idea of God the Father itself.

If I were to choose a symbol of divinity from among the persons of the Trinity, I think I would choose that forgotten third person (though it is really no person at all). I think the concept of God as

Holy Spirit is more believable than the concept of God as the Creator-Father. Yet, humanist heretic I must remain, for I tend to believe that the "holy spirit" is the outpouring of that divine fervor which proceedeth from the heart of the righteous man. It has no other seat in nature. Whether one holding these beliefs should speak at all in theistic symbols, or rather in non-theistic language, is a question that is often argued and one that I shall leave aside. As I see it, it is largely a matter of temperament, a choice of symbols, of determining what makes you feel good and what makes you feel bad in the way of language.

But there is a much more fundamental question which does concern me. That is whether God should be thought of as a power not of ourselves, or as a power in ourselves, by any name we may give it. At the risk of being dogmatic, I would say that I am opposed to any concept whatever, which tends to give men a sense of dependence or reliance on any power or being whatever external to themselves.

The God of classical theology is a monster. To regard him as a God of Love does not make him any less a monster. Love is a snare, a trap for fools, unless love exists among beings who stand upon a plane of equality, a plane where genuine interaction and mutual growth is possible. I can think of nothing more deforming to the human spirit than that religion should always be the sandtrap of an eternal paternalism.

Dr. Eric Fromm points out that both concepts of God exist within the body of Christianity and Judaism. God as a power outside of man upon which man is dependent, he calls the "authoritarian God." God as the spiritual power within man he calls the "humanistic" God. It is this former concept of God, the authoritarian God, which I fear most people mean by a Supreme Being, and which I fear most people mean by religion. If I must choose between this brand of "religion" and atheism—I choose atheism.

It is my conviction that the chief effect of most of Western and Eastern religion, is that it tends to belittle and minimize the spiritual sufficiency of man in the natural world. It tends to regard man as something hopelessly wretched in contrast to his deity, who is something unapproachably grand.

One of the first writers to point out this process whereby the unbridgeable gulf between man and God is created, between the actual and the ideal, was the German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach. Feuerbach attempted to demonstrate that as religious systems develop the distance between man and his ideals increases. The gods serve as containers or vehicles for those principles and ideals which men value most. Man does not feel worthy completely to embody these ideals, and therefore it is natural and easy for him to project the existence of a Being, a state or a realm, where these things exist fully. For example, we believe that love is a value we should pursue,

but we find our capacity to love frustrated. And for many ideas of love we finally abstract an ideal of love as a quality. Then we disembody it. We thrust it into Heaven away from ourselves, separating man the ideal-producer, from man the ideal-worshipper. As the ideal is expanded and enlarged, so the divine tends to become more and more remote and unapproachable. Thus a quality that begins in man, a power within man, ends as a power above man, external to man. In this way authoritarian religion has tended to transfer from earth to heaven the ideal and spiritual powers by which we live. For man there is no hope possible except repentance, forgiveness and dependence upon the infinite, omnipotent, omniscient power above.

I believe that the first task of a liberal faith is to return to earth that holy fire that has escaped to heaven. The religion of an emancipated humanity must be a religion of this world. An age which began with the democratization of kings must proceed with the humanization of gods.

And this brings me to a reiteration of what I would make a first principle: Anything which tends to make men subservient to a power external to themselves is ultimately harmful. It matters not whether that power parades in the uniforms of the State, in the vestments of the Church, or in the rumors which the church puts forth as theology. Its evil is not mitigated because it parades in the lumbering language of a vacuous metaphysics.

The main purpose of a free faith is to make the personality more self-reliant, more integrated within itself and with beings around it. The aim of both liberal democracy and liberal religion is to prepare the way for the inner-directed man—though I know that it will be protested that man is forever dependent upon power that is not ourselves, dependent upon nature itself. It is so. But man masters nature to the extent that he makes nature serve human beings. He has no uncritical devotion in worship of nature. The hands are the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob. The purposes are our own. Now causes and effects seem to operate in the realm of morality and spiritual life and give rise to the assertion that human ideals are supported by a moral law.

There is another way of putting it, a very popular way, which says that there is a "moral grain" in the Universe. I think this probably half true, but as said here I think it is false. I suspect that the moral grain that exists in the Universe exists in that portion of the Universe which we call human nature, and I doubt that it is so immutable as we may think. I suspect that the "moral grain" so called is an emergent quality of human personality rather than the manifestation of a cosmic will. We do well I think to avoid the temptation of assigning human purposes to cosmic processes.

Now for a moment I should like to turn our attention to another peculiar manifestation of theological thinking, the recognition of which enables us to understand better the violent reactions of people,

including ourselves, when our theological assumptions are threatened. If that view is correct which regards theological personages and concepts as the externalized projections of internal ideas, it is entirely understandable why people react so belligerently when their religious opinions are challenged. In the less sophisticated, this alacrity of feeling may reach the pitch of killing the heritage and, even among the liberally-minded, the most common reaction is to impute immaturity or negativism to the challenger.

When one makes it plain to another that he does not put stock in the other's God, what he does in effect is to deny the reality of an important part of the believer himself, or so it would seem to him. To say "God does not exist," or "your God does not exist," is not to deny only the existence to that Being, but rather to threaten the delicately oriented personality of the one who believes. At least this is what the believer hears and reacts to.

Often, for example, we hear our neighbours say that if they did not believe in Heaven, or to use an even stronger example, if they did not believe in Hell, their lives would have no meaning. "I would go out and get drunk. Oh, I would give myself a time."

I do not kill my enemies because my conscience does not let me. Even if I considered myself good enough to violate the law, which in itself might be fun, I know what this killing would do to my self-esteem, my feelings of human compassions. But the person who is not given to analysing his conscience is more likely to say that he does not kill because of the risk of the punishment of God, or because of the risk of going to Hell. Thus, when we remove hell from the theology of the man who relies upon it for his moral discipline, we rob that man of his sense of propriety and decency. So real are these dreams of religion. Even the punitive and restrictive portions of our theology are too much a part of our spiritual anatomy to allow amputation.

Some of us in the United States are quite concerned about the increasing tendency of the government and the public generally to equate religious conformity with political loyalty. The pious air of public offices, from cabinet meetings to school boards, is being hailed as a return to religion. If this were truly an outpouring of altruistic love we would have indeed cause for rejoicing. But what we fear is that "God" has been brought out of the cloister to be let loose as a demon to devour the nonconformist. To use another figure. God is being made the totem of the American political state, so that anyone who declines to pay homage to the totem is suspected of disloyalty to the society itself.

Although the American republic was conceived as a secular state, it is now commonly claimed that belief in democracy is dependent upon belief in God. If anyone has any doubt about the effects of this practice upon our liberty, I would refer him to the firing of the Missouri school teacher on grounds that a person who does not believe in God has no basis to believe in democracy and

therefore no place in the public school. This has happened in more places than Missouri. We are witnessing that 1984 variety of "double think," whereby you can believe in freedom only by renouncing the freedom of belief. God has been made the totem of political survival, the open-sesame of political fortune, the humpty-dumpty of social stability.

What we are letting ourselves in for is an eventual reaction against this religious cant and pretense, a reaction which I fear is likely to sweep aside genuine spiritual values in the common debacle. But even that might be better than our present frame of mind. I think there is something wholesome in the cleansing power of disenchantment. I would think of another characteristic of human behaviour that I shall call "serving the name." Serving the name I believe is an important clue to our religious aspirations and our human behaviour. Serving the name is one of the chief motivations of human enterprise. Its capacity for good or evil is incalculable. Our generation is witness to the fact that serving the name is often a stronger force in human affairs than the fear of personal destruction or the dictates of self-interest. To gain fame for their namesake many have broken their health; they have sacrificed the resources of their family and their friendship and betrayed their fellow men. The careers of the egomaniac dictators are grim caricatures of the length to which men will go in "serving the name."

If we look back over the vistas of religious history, invariably the quest of eternal life has been a constant theme and song of worship. Man, the ideal-producing animal, the name-serving animal, is mesmerized with the hope of passing from shade to shade without the loss of himself. And in the name he finds a part of this quest. If we accept the thesis which I have developed, that the deities and demons of mythology and popular religion are symbolic projections of the human heart) then it makes sense to wonder if the various gods, including our own, are not the totems of men's hunt for immortality. The gods are necessary footmen for the royal coaches of a never-ending journey. But man is not always literally minded despite the tendency of religion to speak in plastic forms and concrete imagery. Yet even those of us who turn our backs on Heaven do not despise the song of that Lorelei—the name singer. We have often heard said, "The immortality I seek is the good which I shall give to those which come after me. The immortality I seek is in the influence on which I shall have on those who come after me." So speaks man, the monument builder.

Serving the name does not mean that we are necessarily impelled to make our names live as long as the names of Socrates and Caesar. It may not be our personal appellations we seek to perpetuate. Rather it may be the name of some object or quality which is our *summum bonum*. We may seek our immortality in the cause of human freedom, with Lincoln, or in the cause of compassion and reverence for life, with Schweitzer. We may say that while justice

is alive—I live. While life is exalted—I am exalted. While there walks in the land the spirit of unselfish love, I shall not walk entirely in the valley of the shadow. My immortality is here. I build no separate monolith for my soul's happiness. My life is here in the cathedral of all souls. Thus serving the name which begins as a struggle for survival can become a source of infinite spiritual possibility. We can die with untroubled equanimity when our immortality has been secured in the love of the lives about us. Horace Mann said something like this when he said, "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity."

I think that when one of us contemplates the fact that a hundred years from now he will not exist, he finds much of the meaning of his own life in this. Immortality is made by the consecration of oneself to those things which deserve to live forever. Perhaps this again is not too far from the thought of Edgar Lee Masters' *Spoon River Anthology*. He calls up the dead village atheist who speaks from the grave:

"Immortality is not a gift,

Immortality is an achievement,

And only those who strive mightily shall possess it."

Whether there is any immortality other than in the sense that we live in those who survive us is a subject on which I do not believe it is fruitful to speculate.

Now, such a faith as I have tried to outline briefly is only "half a religion," it will be said. I believe it is half a religion only if one holds a truncated view of man and nature. If one regards the human as purely intellectual, then it is true. But there is room in this philosophy for poetry, for the arts and for mysticism. This is, of course, an aesthetic appreciation which does not pretend to be a superior kind of knowledge above reason. I do not believe that faith transcends reason. I believe that doctrine is one of the most damning things that has ever been preached to human beings. I believe that there is one path to knowledge, and one path only. That is the one commonly called the scientific method. Inductive reasoning.

As for our impressions, our sensations, our intuitions, these things are important and I would not deny it. But they are the raw materials on which the mind works. They do not transcend reason. If they are allowed to, we are in very serious trouble.¹

Thirty years ago Albert Schweitzer began a sermon which he has not ended yet. In that sermon Schweitzer argued and pleaded that man should return to his faith in reason. He pointed out that rationalism (that had developed against so many obstacles) was

¹ I am here drawing a distinction which I think should always be made between empirical knowledge and statements of value. When we go around promiscuously talking of "truth," meaning one time that I believe it is true that Sydney is in Australia and at another time that I believe it is true that Beethoven was a great artist, I do not think we are using the word "truth" in the same sense at all. We are confusing ourselves.

being abandoned in the twentieth century. No matter how beautiful the siren call of the oracles may be, they can only herald the opening of a new age of barbarism. I believe that in view of what has happened in the world his thesis demands more consideration.

I believe that the intellectual type is the highest type of man. I believe that the great artists are first of all great intellectuals. They may not operate in the realm of the natural scientists. But the creative is not opposed to the intellectual. Name the great artists, and see who they were.

The attack on intellectualism which rages so unabated, and which has its corrosive influence even in liberal circles, can end only in romanticism and (worse yet) in that undisciplined occultism which prepares the human mind for unchecked emotion—fascism in politics, fundamentalism in religion, obscurantism in philosophy and the arts.

Personally, I find it as difficult to believe in a little bit of magic as in a great deal of magic. What we need is more reason, not less reason. And I cannot avoid the temptation to say that I for one stand before the altar of the “intellectual Johnnys”—the John Lockes, the John Stewart Mills, and the John Deweys.

We need a new approach to religion, not just a retreading of the Christian way.

Orthodox Christianity is founded upon principles which are not compatible with human-centered free thinking. Christians have bent their principles into such forms when it has been considered the thing to do, but under protest. Orthodox religion has become quite civilized, but whenever it sees the opportunity, it reacts. It goes back to kind. It will be said that what we have is a cut-flower morality, if we do not believe in the theology which is said to uphold our social history.

I do not believe that continuing the work of Franklin as a scientist depends upon wearing the same kind of buckle shoes that Franklin wore. And I do not believe that the morality of Jesus, or Gandhi, or of anyone else can in any way be said to be dependent upon the theology and the metaphysical systems those people may have developed.

In conclusion, I think I should agree with Ingersoll who said, “Happiness is the only good, Reason the only truth, Justice the only worship, Humanity the only religion, and Love the only reason.”

Edward Ericson, Minister of the Unitarian Church at Eugene, Oregon, since 1954, holds the M.A. and B.D. degrees of Stetson University and completed his training for the Ministry at the Starr King School. He has published a volume of some 24 prayers which is worthy of wider circulation, especially where humanists and theists worship together.

F. J. Hamblin (Article, p. 13) is Minister of the Old Meeting House, Coseley, Staffs. Previous article “Speaking with Authority yet Free,” Vol. 7, Pt. 1, No. 19.

Appeal to Humanity

ALBERT SCHWEITZER*

SINCE March 1st, 1954, hydrogen bombs have been tested, by the Americans at the Pacific island of Bikini in the Marshall group and by the Russians in Siberia. We know that testing of atomic weapons is something quite different from testing of non-atomic ones.

When earlier a new type of giant gun had been tried on the test field the matter ended with the detonation. After the explosion of a hydrogen bomb that is not the case. Something remained in the air, namely, an uncalculable number of radioactive particles emitting radioactive rays. This was also the case with the uranium bombs which were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima and those with which subsequent tests were made. However, because these bombs had smaller size and less effect compared with the hydrogen bombs, one hardly paid any attention to this fact. Since radioactive rays of sufficient amount and strength have harmful effects on the human body, one started discussing if the radiation resulting from the explosions that had already taken place represented a danger which would increase with new explosions.

Radiation Danger

In the course of the three and a half years that have passed since then representatives of the physical and medical sciences have been studying the problem. Observations on the existence, distribution, origin and nature of radiation have been made. The processes through which the human body is harmfully affected have been analysed.

The material collected, although far from complete, allows us to draw the conclusion that radiation resulting from the explosions which have already taken place represents a danger to the human race, a danger not to be underrated, and that further explosions of atomic bombs will increase this danger to an alarming extent. This conclusion has repeatedly been expressed especially during the last few months. It has not, however, strange to say, influenced public opinion to the extent that one might have expected. Individuals and peoples have not been excited to give to this danger the attention which it unfortunately deserves. It must be demonstrated and made clear to them.

I raise my voice, together with those of others who have lately felt it their duty to act, in speaking and writing, as warners of the danger. My age and the sympathy that I have gained for myself through advocating the idea of reverence for life, permit me to hope that my appeal may contribute to the preparing of the way for the insight so urgently needed.

* Dr. Schweitzer's 'Appeal to Humanity' was first broadcast from Oslo.

Radioactivity?

My thanks go to the radio station in Oslo, the city of the Nobel Peace Prize, for making it possible for that which I feel I have to say, to reach far off places.

What is radioactivity? Radioactivity consists in the occurrence of rays differing from those of light in being invisible and in being able to pass not only through glass but also through thin metal discs and through layers of cell tissue in the human and animal bodies. Rays of this kind were first discovered in 1895 by the physicist Wilhelm Roentgen, of Munich, and were named after him. In 1896 the French physicists Henry Becquerel demonstrated that rays of this kind occur in nature. They are emitted from uranium, an element known since 1786. In 1898 Pierre Curie and his wife discovered in the mineral pitch-blende (an uranium ore,) the strongly radio-active element radium.

The joy caused by the fact that such rays were at the disposal of humanity was at first unmixed. It appeared that they influenced the relatively rapidly-growing and relatively rapidly-decaying cells of malignant tumors and sarcomas. If exposed to these rays repeatedly for a longer period, they will be destroyed.

Madame Curie

After a time one found, however, that the destruction of cancer cells did not always mean the cure of cancer and that also the normal cells of the body are seriously damaged if exposed to radioactive rays for a longer time.

When Mme. Curie, after having handled uranium ore for four years, finally held the first gramme of radium in her hand there appeared tears in the skin which no treatment could cure. With the years she grew steadily worse from a disease caused by radioactive rays having damaged her bone marrow and, through that, her blood. In 1934 death put an end to her suffering.

For many years one was not aware of the risk involved in X-rays for those constantly exposed to them and through their operating X-ray apparatus thousands of doctors and nurses have incurred incurable diseases leading to a slow death. Radioactive rays are material things. Through them the radioactive element constantly and forcefully emits tiny particles of itself.

Three Kinds of Rays

There are three kinds of radioactive rays. They are named after the three first letters of the Greek alphabet, *alpha*, *beta*, *gamma*. The *gamma* rays are the hardest ones and have the strongest effect. The reason why elements emit radioactive rays are that they are in a continuous state of decaying. Their radioactivity is the energy liberated little by little.

There are other elements besides uranium and radium which are radioactive, although very little so. To the radiation from the elements in the earth is added the radiation from space, to the

extent that it reaches us. Fortunately the air mass 400 kilometres high surrounding our earth protects us against this radiation. Only a very small fraction of it reaches us. If it had hit the earth with full intensity all life would be annihilated. We are, then, constantly being exposed to radioactive radiation coming from the earth and from space. It is so weak, however, that it does not hurt us. Stronger sources of radiation, as for instance X-ray cameras, and radium, have, as we know, harmful effects if one is exposed to them for some time.

The radioactive rays are, as I said, invisible. How can we tell that they are there and how strong they are? Thanks to the German physicist Hans Geiger, who died in 1945 as a victim to X-rays, we have an instrument which makes that possible. This instrument is called the Geiger counter and consists of a metal tube containing rarified air. In it are two metal electrodes between which is a high potential. Radioactive rays from the outside affect the tube and release a discharge between the two electrodes. The stronger the radiation the quicker the discharges follow one another. A small device connected to the tube makes the discharge audible. The Geiger counter performs a veritable drum roll when the discharges are strong.

There are two kinds of atom bombs: uranium bombs and hydrogen bombs. The effect of a uranium bomb is due to a process liberating energy by fission of uranium. In the hydrogen bomb the liberation of energy is the result of the transformation of hydrogen into helium. It is interesting to note that this process is the same as that which is taking place in the centre of the sun, supplying it with the self-renewing energy which it is emitting in the form of light and heat.

In principle the effect of both bombs is the same. But according to various estimates the effect of one of the latest hydrogen bombs is 200 times stronger than the one which was dropped on Hiroshima. To these two bombs has recently been added the cobalt bomb, a kind of super atom bomb. It is a hydrogen bomb surrounded by a layer of cobalt. The effect of this bomb is estimated to be many times stronger than that of hydrogen bombs made up till now.

The explosion of an atom bomb creates an inconceivably large number of exceedingly small particles of radioactive elements which decay like uranium or radium. Some of these particles decay very quickly, others more slowly, and some of them extraordinary slowly. The strongest of these elements cease to exist only 10 seconds after the detonation of the bomb. But in this short time they may have killed a great number of people in a circumference of several miles.

Clouds of Dust carried by Winds

What remains are the less powerful elements. In our time it is with these we have to deal. It is of the danger arising from the radioactive rays emitted by these elements that we must be aware. Of these elements some exist for hours, some for weeks, or months,

or years or millions of years, undergoing continuous decay. They float in the higher strata of air as clouds of radioactive dust. The heavy particles fall down first. The lighter ones will stay in the air for a longer time or come down with the rain and the snow.

How long it will take before everything carried up in the air by the explosions which have taken place till now has disappeared, no one can say with any certainty. According to some estimates, this will be the case not earlier than thirty or forty years from now.

When I was a boy I witnessed how the dust slung up in the air from the explosion in 1883 of the island of Krakatoa, in the Sunda group, was noticeable for two years afterwards to such an extent that the sunsets were given extraordinary splendour by it. What we can state with certainty, however, is that the radioactive clouds will constantly be carried by the winds around the globe and that some of the dust, by its own weight, or by being brought down by rain, snow, mist and dew, little by little, will fall down on the hard surface of the earth, into the rivers and into the oceans.

Of what nature are these radioactive elements, particles of which were carried up in the air by the explosion of atom bombs and which are now falling down again? They are strange variants of the usual non-radioactive elements. They have the same chemical properties, but a different atom weight. Their names are always accompanied by their atom weights. The same element can occur in several radioactive variants. Besides Iodine 131, which lives for 16 days, we have Iodine 129, which lives for 200 million years.

In Air and Rain

Dangerous elements of this kind are: Phosphorus 32, Calcium 45, Iodine 131, Iron 55, Bismuth 210, Plutonium 239, Cerium 144, Strontium 89, Caesium 137. If the hydrogen bomb is covered by cobalt, Cobalt 60 must be added to the list.

Particularly dangerous are the elements combining long life with a relatively strong efficient radiation. Among them Strontium 90 takes the first place. It is present in very large amounts in the radioactive dust. Cobalt 60 must also be mentioned as particularly dangerous.

The radioactivity in the air, increased through these elements, will not harm us from the outside, not being strong enough to penetrate the skin. It is another matter with respiration, through which radioactive elements can enter our bodies. But the danger which has to be stressed above all the others is the one which arises from our drinking radioactive water and our eating radioactive food as a consequence of the increased radioactivity in the air. Following the explosions of Bikini and Siberia, rain falling over Japan has, from time to time, been so radioactive that the water from it cannot be drunk. And not only there. Reports of radioactive rainfall are coming from all parts of the world where analyses have recently been made.

In Soil and Plants

In several places the water has proved to be so radioactive that it was unfit for drinking. Well-water becomes radioactive to any considerable extent only after longer periods of heavy rainfall. Wherever radioactive rainwater is found the soil is also radioactive—and in a higher degree. The soil is made radioactive not only by the downpour, but also from radioactive dust falling on it. And with the soil the vegetation will also have become radioactive. The radioactive elements deposited in the soil pass into the plants where they are stored. This is of importance, for as a result of this process it may be the case that we are threatened by a considerable amount of radioactive elements.

The radioactive elements in grass, when eaten by animals whose meat is used for food, will be absorbed and stored in our bodies. In the case of cows the absorption is effected through our drinking their milk. In that way even small children, to whom they are especially dangerous, run the risk of absorbing radioactive elements. When we eat cheese and fruits the radioactive elements stored in them are transferred to us. What this storing of radioactive material implies, is clearly demonstrated by the observation made when, at one occasion, the radioactivity of the river Columbia, in North America, was analysed.

Evading the Problem

The radioactivity was caused by the atomic plants at Hanford, which produce atomic energy for industrial purposes, and which empty their waste water into the river. The radioactivity of the river water was insignificant. But the radioactivity of the river plankton was 2,000 times higher, that of the ducks eating the plankton 40,000 times higher, that of the fish 15,000 times higher. In young swallows fed on insects caught by their parents in the river the radioactivity was 500,000 times higher and in the egg yolks of water birds more than 1,000,000 times higher.

From official and unofficial sources we have been assured, time and time again, that the increase in radioactivity of the air does not exceed the amount which the human body can tolerate without any harmful effects. This is just evading the problem. Even if not directly affected by the radioactive material in the air, we are indirectly affected through that which has fallen down, is falling down, and will fall down.

Cellular Tissue

We are absorbing this through radioactive drinking water and through animal and vegetable foodstuffs, to the same extent as radioactive elements are stored in the vegetation of the region in which we live. Unfortunately for us nature hoards what is falling down from the air. None of the radioactivity of the air, brought into existence by the exploding of atom bombs, is so unimportant that it may not, in the long run, become a danger to us through increasing the amount of radioactivity stored in our bodies.

What we absorb of radioactivity is not spread evenly in all cellular tissue. It is deposited in certain parts of our body, particularly in the bone tissue and also in the spleen and in the liver. From those sources the organs which are especially sensitive to it are exposed to radiation. What the radiation lacks in strength is compensated for by time. It works day and night without interruption.

Diseases caused

How does radiation affect the cells of an organ? Through being ionized, that is to say, electrically charged. This change means that the chemical processes which make it possible for the cells to do their job in our body, no longer function as they should. They are no longer able to perform the tasks which are of vital importance to us. We must also bear in mind that a great number of the cells of an organ may degenerate or die as a result of radiation.

What are the diseases caused by internal radiation? The same diseases that are known to be caused by external radiation. They are mainly serious blood diseases. The cells of the red bone marrow, where the red and white blood corpuscles are formed, are very sensitive to radioactive rays. It is these corpuscles, found in great numbers in the blood, which make it possible for it to play such an important part. If the cells in the bone marrow are damaged by radiation they will produce too few, or abnormal, degenerating, blood corpuscles. Both cases lead to blood diseases and, most often, to death. These were the diseases that killed the victims of X-rays and radium rays.

Our Descendants

It was one of these diseases that attacked the Japanese fishermen who were surprised in their vessel by radioactive ashes falling down 240 miles from Bikini after the explosion of a hydrogen bomb. Being strong and relatively mildly affected, they were all, with one exception, saved through continuous blood transfusions. In the cases cited the radiation came from outside. It is unfortunately very probable that internal radiation affecting the bone marrow and lasting for years will have the same effect, particularly since the radiation goes from the bone tissue to the bone marrow. As I have said, the radioactive elements are by preference stored in the bone tissue.

Not our own health only is threatened by internal radiation, but also that of our descendants. The fact is that the cells of the reproductive organs are particularly vulnerable to radiation, which in this case attacks the nucleus to such an extent that it can be seen in the microscope. To the profound damage of these cells corresponds a profound damage to our descendants. It consists in still births and in the births of babies with mental or physical defects.

In this context also we can point to the effects of radiation coming from outside. It is a fact—even if the statistical material being published in the Press needs checking—that in Nagasaki during the years following the dropping of the atom bomb an exceptionally high occurrence of still births and of deformed children was observed.

To find out how the existing radioactive radiation has affected posterity, comparative studies have been made between the descendants of doctors who have been using X-ray apparatus for years and those doctors who have not. The material of this study comprises about 3,000 doctors in each group. A noticeable difference was found. Among the descendants of radiologists a per thousand of still births of 1.403 was found, while the per thousand among non-radiologists were 1.222. In the first group 6.01 per cent of the children had congenital defects, while only 4.82 per cent in the second.

The number of healthy children in the first group was 80.42 per cent; the number in the other was significantly higher, viz. 83.23 per cent.

Full Effects

It must be remembered that even the weakest of internal radiation can have harmful effects on our descendants. The total effect of the damage done to descendants of ancestors who have been exposed to radioactive rays will not, in accordance with the laws of genetics, be apparent in the generations coming immediately after us. The full effects will appear only 100 or 200 years later.

As the matter stands we cannot at present cite cases of serious damage done by internal radiation. To the extent that such radiation exists it is not sufficiently strong and has not lasted long enough to have caused the damage in question. We can only conclude from the harmful effects known to be caused by external radiation to those we must expect in the future from internal radiation. If the effect of the latter is not as strong as that of the former, it may become so, through working little by little and without interruption and thus obtain the same effect as the stronger rays coming from the outside. The final result will be the same in both cases. Their effects are added up.

We must also remember that internal radiation has not, in contrast to that coming from the outside, to penetrate layers of skin, tissues and muscles to hit the organs. It works at close range and without any weakening of its force. When we realise under what conditions the internal radiation is working, we cease to underrate it.

Further Explosions

Even if it is true that, when speaking of the dangers of internal radiation, we can point to no actual case, only express our fear, that fear is so solidly founded on facts that it attains the weight of reality in determining our attitude. We are forced to regard every increase in the existing danger through further creation of radioactive elements by atom bomb explosions as a catastrophe for the human race, a catastrophe that must be prevented under every circumstance.

There can be no question of doing anything else, if only for the reason that we cannot take the responsibility for the consequences it might have for our descendants. They are threatened by the greatest and most terrible danger.

That radioactive elements created by us are found in nature, is an astounding event in the history of the earth and of the human race. To fail to consider its importance and its consequences would be a folly for which humanity would have to pay a terrible price. We are committing this folly in thoughtlessness.

It must not happen that we do not pull ourselves together before it is too late. We must muster the insight, the seriousness and the courage to leave this folly, and face reality. This is at bottom what the statesmen of the nations producing atom bombs are thinking, too. Through the reports they are receiving they are sufficiently informed to form their own judgment, and we must also assume that they are alive to their responsibility.

Public Opinion

At any rate, America and Russia and Britain are telling one another again and again that they want nothing better than to reach an agreement to end the testing of atomic weapons. At the same time, however, they declare that they cannot stop the tests as long as there is no such agreement. Why do they not come to an agreement? The real reason is that in their own countries there is no public opinion asking for it. Nor is there any such public opinion in other countries, with the exception of Japan. This opinion has been forced upon the Japanese people because, little by little they will be hit in a most terrible way by the evil consequences of all the tests.

An agreement of this kind presupposes reliability and trust. There must be guarantees preventing the agreement from being signed by anyone intending to win important tactical advantages foreseen only by him. Public opinion in all nations concerned must inspire and accept the agreement. When public opinion has been created in the countries concerned and among all nations, an opinion informed of the dangers involved in going on with the tests and led by the reason which this information imposes, then the statesmen may reach an agreement to stop the experiments.

Sunrays of Hope

A public opinion of this kind stands in no need of plebiscites or of forming of committees to express itself. It works through just being there. The end of further experiments with atom bombs would be like the early sunrays of hope for which suffering humanity is longing.

The Liberal Church of the Future

KURT HANSLOWE and CONSTANCE YOUNG

WE are living in a society that is becoming constantly more highly organized, and this is a trend that will continue to be ever more apparent in the future. One has only to note these and

similar facts to be convinced that the society of the future will be one of "power pluralism." At the present time, fifteen million workers in the United States are organized into labor unions. At least half of our farmers are organized into huge farm organizations. Most fields of industry are dominated by great corporations. Every trade and every industry, almost without exception, has one or more trade associations. Every profession is organized into professional associations. The government in all countries is immensely powerful, reaching down into the life and pocket of the individual. In the future, human action will increasingly take place largely through institutions, and will in that sense be collective action.

It is in a society characterized by power pluralism with a vast spread of knowledge and advancing science and technology that the church of the future must find its place. Religious institutions generally have in the past been closely related in content and structure to the kind of society they served. Thus, the religion of primitive tribal collectivist society was largely superstitious, daimonic, and polytheistic in character. When primitive society was succeeded by autocratic cultures, primitive polytheism was followed by monotheistic religions and theologies postulating an authoritarian or benignly paternalistic deity. Autocratic and aristocratic society is in turn being replaced by science and democracy. "This development," in the words of Rudolf Dreikurs, "raises an important question: Will this third, the democratic phase of human culture be without any specific religion, or will it develop its own religion in line with its new social perspectives? There can be no doubt that each of the two previous cultural phases of mankind, primitive society and aristocratic civilization, had its appropriate form of religion. Any religious expression of the democratic cultural era will have to be characteristically different. But will there be a new religion? And if so, what form will it take?"

In considering this question, two primary observations should be made. First, the church must be viewed as a social institution of human beings, organized for certain purposes—among other institutions organized for other purposes. Second, a church, to be effective in the future, must be the expression of a religion consistent with, and vitally related to, modern knowledge and modern society. It must, at the same time, be consistent with science, with democracy, and with art in its broadest sense. We believe that contemporary universalism and unitarianism, and liberal religion generally, have made but the smallest beginnings in developing the kind of church required for an age of science, democracy, and highly organized human action.

Since liberal religion is, in one of its aspects, a movement of free individuals exercising free minds in religious affairs as opposed to various forms of religious orthodoxy, it has been uneasy about institutional power, and has made much of the need for each person to be free in his thinking about religion. The liberal church has been

an individualistic movement. With this emphasis, it is not surprising that we find this character persisting today. It explains, incidentally, the snobbery which is shown by many towards the idea of making liberal religion a "mass movement" and the generally complacent attitude of belonging to a movement of quality rather than quantity. Yet the church must take cognizance of the trend towards larger organizations. We can no longer, in our political, economic and religious thinking, view society as consisting of small and weak organizations among which the family is the dominant institution. We must revise the *icon* which we carry in our mind's eye of religious as well as other social institutions. Certainly, the liberal church cannot become a formative influence in society unless it has a clear understanding of the structure of that society. An institution, equally with individuals, cannot be in the world and not of it. And the church is no exception.

The question presents itself therefore whether, in this free, democratic, institutionalized and scientific society which we envisage for the future, our individualistic attitudes will meet the needs of such a society. The question arises also whether the present practices in the church service and in our educational programs for both adults and children, our community relationships and all the other elements that go into the complex of the functioning church, are not more of a heritage of the past than appropriate to a present in line with our vision of the future.

* * *

It is the purpose of the writers of this article (1) to attempt some analysis of what is now the current practice of the liberal church and (2) to suggest some areas in which more creative thought and action are demanded.

The Functions of the Liberal Church

Let us attempt to define the function of a liberal church in the modern world. We do not in any way propose the following as definitive; rather it is highly tentative and is really designed only to serve as a springboard for further and broader study. We conceive the main functions of liberal religion to be:

- (1) The integration of man with self; self-understanding and full development of creative individual capacities.
- (2) The integration of man with man—the adjustment of the individual to society.
- (3) The integration of man with the Cosmos—an attempt at understanding the nature of the universe and the individual's relationship with it.
- (4) The building of ethics and ethical conduct into the modern, power-pluralistic society; this will come about to a considerable extent as a result of the achievement of the preceding three functions. It will, however, also require effective organization of liberal religion, especially insofar as institutional—as distinguished from individualistic—behavior is to be influenced.

Approaches—The Full Use of Knowledge

For the liberal church to achieve these purposes and make its unique contribution, we would suggest three major approaches. The first of these is the full use of knowledge in relation to the individual and to groups. The Twentieth Century has yielded power to man not only through the physical sciences but also through the development of psychological knowledge. The proverb notes that, "he that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city." And Socrates based his teaching on the premise of the dictate, "Know thyself." Modern knowledge of the deep springs of human behavior, which received such dramatic impetus from Freud, has made it possible in the way not dreamed of a century ago for man really to know himself. And such writers as Ashley Montagu, Sophia Fahs, and a host of others have given the basis for a new attitude to man. They have shown that man is not inherently sinful or hostile but has, as his strongest potential, the capacity to love. This concept of man's nature has wrought a revolutionary change of attitude among psychiatrists and child guidance specialists. Nor should we ignore the intriguing potentialities of group psychotherapy and parapsychology. But only a small number of people, even in the liberal church, really act as though this were a true concept of man's nature and potentialities. No other organization is potentially as well able as the liberal church to interpret these discoveries and concepts of self-understanding and self-acceptance in an age of anxiety and of shifting mores and values. The church which has committed itself to a belief in process is peculiarly adapted to mediate to its people the findings of scientific and socio-biologic research.

What does this mean in terms of program? For people to be able to achieve a progressive integration of the self, self-knowledge is a basic necessity. The present inadequate or non-existent counselling services in our churches underlines the necessity of a focus of attention in this area. Unless the church is alert to the new development and experiments in helping the individual to become integrated and to be a whole person, it will default in one of the most productive aspects of its work. The liberal church has lagged behind others in making available skilled counselling services.

Group therapy offers rewarding avenues of investigation, and where it has been tried on even a limited basis it has proved to be of great value. The growth of small groups will continue to be a factor in society. Their growth is due, in part, to the need which all persons have to feel themselves an intimate part of a like-minded group. The National Training Laboratory and the Adult Education Association have been carrying forward research projects during the last two or three decades which have provided insight into the development potential of groups. Since much of the activity of a church is carried on through groups, that church will function most effectively which incorporates the new knowledge concerning group process and group behavior recently been made available through research.

Most liberal churches make use of the new knowledge from the physical sciences, but even here there is room for greater understanding and more clearly expressed goals. Fundamental findings of the modern physical sciences must necessarily be taken into account. This would include a consideration of astronomy, physics, and biochemistry. It should include also the study of philosophy which is, after all, the "science of knowing," and an attempt at the integration of all knowledge. We believe that if modern man is ever to come to a valid understanding of God, such understanding can only be achieved after full consideration of all knowledge concerning the Cosmos.

It is as true for theology as it is for other sciences, both social and physical, that valid "intuitive" insights must be firmly grounded on existing knowledge, and such knowledge, for the theologian, must necessarily be of cosmological scope.

Organization

The second approach for the achievement of the functions of liberal religion and the liberal church is organization. As we have noted, the church must be viewed as a social institution among other institutions. Its functions and purposes can no longer be achieved by the individual practising his liberal religion in solitude. Organization into an effective institution is necessary to enable it to achieve its purposes and fulfil its functions. In an age of giant government and giant organization, liberal religion too must organize. In doing this, as Jacob Trapp writes, "the principle to be kept in mind . . . is that of the utmost possible combination of freedom with effective organization, as not 'impossible' (to borrow a word from the older dictionaries) but mutually serving and strengthening one another." The continuing Universalist-Unitarian merger conversations in the United States provide an ideal vehicle for the intensive consideration of this principle and of improving our present structure as an effective nation-wide institution.

This kind of effective organization has many implications. One is the setting up of a rich and full educational program for both adults and children. The present educational program of most churches will be increasingly outmoded in an age of increasingly efficient institutions. Consider the program as it exists in the majority of churches. There is the Sunday service, geared to adult understanding; there is the school of religion or the church school, organized by a paid director or a volunteer superintendent and staffed by volunteer teachers, often untrained; there are various adult and youth organizations, more or less loosely tied together by a council or a board of directors. There is no careful job analysis done of what is required of minister or director. Only in a few churches is there a clearly thought-out and integrated program designed to meet the individual and group needs of its membership. While, in many churches, children are still relegated to basements or poorly equipped classrooms and the church is considered to exist

primarily for adults, and its major concern is the Sunday morning service.

Where a creative religious education program is carried on, there is often a dichotomy existing between the educational philosophy of the church school curriculum and the Sunday morning service. In the one the emphasis is on change and growth through interaction, group projects and discussion. In the other, there is individual leadership and a congregation of listeners.

In the church of the future, the program must be a unified whole, developing in accordance with a constantly redefined philosophy. The church service, no less than the school of religion, and the total program of activities, will come under scrutiny and its relation to the total plan will be under continual study. The present haphazard and loosely organized adult education program must give way to one which will serve more effectively both the participants and the community. There is need for an organizational structure which will possess cohesion without rigidity and flexibility without slackness.

The development of this kind of organization will concern the theological seminaries, for it will mean a new kind of leadership. In many of our liberal churches, the minister will continue, for a long time to come, to function in many areas, including that of the training of leadership and of teachers, and in the structuring of a program for a school of religion and for adult groups. It is, therefore, of primary importance that the minister of the church of the future shall be trained through practice to understand the needs and development of children. The church which ceases to be a teaching church, ceases. Until the seminaries offer adequate opportunity for a well-rounded education for the ministry, sending men out equipped to teach and to understand their role, the life of liberal religion will continue to receive inadequate sustenance at its growing edge.

Undoubtedly, there will be more churches in the future who will have directors of their educational programs. At the present time inferior status is given to those entrusted with one of the most significant enterprises of the church. Part of this is due to the fact that seminaries are not offering a training commensurate with the responsibilities of this profession. Those who are interested in working in the field of religion with children and wish to be professionally equipped must, with few exceptions, take their training in non-liberal institutions. There is, at the present time, no minimum salary scale, and the maximum is about that paid to an inexperienced public school teacher in our larger cities.

If the liberal church wishes to have its children growing up in the liberal faith, the time is at hand for a basic reappraisal of what it is doing and what needs to be done. Experiment and research, training and experience, well-equipped buildings, and a three-hour program with paid teachers will become the rule rather than the exception. The liberal church should be doing a far better than average job in this area. If the church can give to the child the

kinds of religious experience that are positive and full of meaning, it will be helping to make possible the growth of a well-integrated human being. The minister needs to have a deep understanding of the beginnings of religion during the years of childhood, the emotional factors which block or enlarge growth and a knowledge of the needs of the various age levels. He needs these insights to enable him to counsel adults competently when they seek help with their children.

The education program for adults is equally open for reappraisal. Many adults come to the liberal church for the first time as adults. The reaction is from some creed which they feel to be no longer adequate. They do not understand the basic approach of the liberal church and they continue to be persons who are against rather than for. It would seem that a creative church would feel that necessity of a clear and well-defined purpose, a statement of philosophy. Perhaps the church of the future will not accept members without devising some means such as an informal course of study, for determining whether they really understand the liberal faith.

Symbol and Ritual

The third approach which follows inevitably in making the liberal church a creatively functioning institution is a careful review of our use of ritual and symbol. We believe that contemporary Unitarianism and Universalism, and liberal religion in general, have made only the smallest beginnings in meeting the need for a symbolism and ritual fitting an age of science, democracy, and highly organized human action. Many present practices seem to us to be inconsistent within themselves and offensive to both art and science. We draw attention to our largely unimaginative and pedestrian efforts in connection with public worship. Our services are often an unfortunate and distracting mixture of modified Protestant orthodoxy, interrupted by a ringing sermon on liberalism. A prayer, humanist in orientation, is followed by an anthem of late Victorian vintage. We lack the sacramental cohesion of the Catholic Mass and the Biblical fundamentalism of orthodox Protestantism. Yet we have, thus far, largely failed in creating a necessary positive substitute. It is our deep conviction that a church which is to minister to the needs of the human spirit must create a ritual and symbolism that expresses its genius. To find it, we must rethink radically both our functions and our forms. Otherwise, we shall stifle—a ridiculous splinter of protest, with one foot still in orthodoxy and one foot out, but without the first step completed and without the knowledge of the direction in which to take it.

Let us examine, for example, the symbol of the pulpit and the pew. A great gulf of space separates minister and people. It is open to question whether this is appropriate to the spirit of a free and a democratically organized church. This does not seek to minimize the significance of the minister and pulpit as symbols of freedom. It does suggest that in a creative church, the symbol of distance

might be exchanged for that of group participation on a deeper level. The practice in some churches where the minister leaves the raised platform and joins the people for meditation is symbolic of such group participation. It is a symbol of a minister thinking with, rather than for, his people. Current experiments in such diverse places as St. Louis, Chicago and Boston with Worship in the Round, Town Meetings after the service, and symbols representative of science and world unity suggest fruitful areas of exploration. There is need of pooling and testing of these experiences.

The cold hand of puritanism is still laid on the church. Its distrust of color and form and beauty, if unrecognized, still lingers among us. And a static traditionalism continues to hold back and stifle change. The great tradition of freedom, which is our heritage, lays upon us the responsibility of making certain that freedom of worship be expressed by freedom in form. We are living in an age when the great music of all periods is accessible to all, merely by the flick of a knob. Why then must we continue to endure second or third-rate music in our churches? Music, as a shared experience of beauty is a "deep calling into deep"—the truly universal language of an all-encompassing religion.

Some churches have made notable progress in their attempts to have the form express the spirit. This is indicated in church architecture where some encouraging beginnings have been made. In many churches, stained-glass windows and pseudo-Gothic have given way to sunlight and functional beauty. The resources of art as well as of music are available, yet the bareness of our church walls bears witness to our distrust of beauty as a part of religion. If our concept of religion is one of a growing, changing, creative process, a "closing-up truth to new truth as we find it," then this concept must inform our ritual and our symbol. For each church this will be different, since it will grow out of the living, dynamic life of each church. It will be, therefore, not the creation of one person but of many, and the form of the church service will seek to interpret the people to themselves, to each other, and to gather them up into a living, creative whole. We must devise symbols of courage, unity and co-operation. Indeed, the church as a whole must become both in its structure and practice a prophecy of the world to come, symbolizing the future universality of the human race. There must be an intellectually and emotionally unified worship, designed to symbolize and invite dedication to freedom, democracy, the brotherhood of man, the appreciation of the beauty of nature and of the magnificence of the universe and the glory of the Creative Spirit.

The liberal church, on the whole, has shown a paucity of imagination and an unwillingness to experiment deeply with ritual and symbol. Candles are used in a rather meaningless way; an uninspired congregation mumbles through responsive readings in most orders of service; there is unpractised singing of hymns which often do not express the liberal approach; and there is a sermon.

For many people this is a relatively satisfying experience. But we maintain that there is much more to be done. If the church is to help its people grow, why not, for example, have one Sunday in the month when questions asked by members of the congregation form the substance of the service? This surely is a symbol of the people searching together for truth, when all have an opportunity to understand how truth may be arrived at through the sharing of the deepest thinking of all. Or, why not have expressed, occasionally through modern creative dance, the emotions and yearnings of the human spirit? Liberal churches have a great deal to say about brotherhood. It may be that we need to find more appropriate expression of this through the character of our services. Perhaps it would give a greater sense of reality if people who have suffered from the intolerance of our society could appear more often in our church to discuss reason and remedy. This would indeed provide its own symbolism. What we are saying in effect is that the liberal church cannot remain static in a changing world. It must ever stand at the house of the interpreter, making it possible for people to understand the forces that work in themselves and in society, and create spiritual meaning from the stuff of our existence. It means that the church must have a twofold reference; the one, contemporary, pointing out and clarifying present happenings, and the other, eternal, finding a continuing meaning for life. Symbols of change and of growth; rituals expressing the creative and the emerging; organization designed to compass the educational and social needs of its people; knowledge ever growing and ever more inclusive—these will characterize the living church in a dynamic age.

* * *

We have outlined these three approaches to fulfil the functions and achieve the purposes of the liberal church as we view them. What we suggest may indeed be a radical redefinition and reshaping of liberal religion and the liberal church practising it. We believe that congregational discussions must take place. As many individual congregations as possible should re-think the problem of the function and purposes of the liberal church and the methods for fulfilling and achieving them. In addition, a denominational (we mean, of course, to include Universalists as well as Unitarians and possibly others) commission should also be established to study these same questions long and hard, having as one of its additional functions the collection and co-ordination of the results of the local discussions and experiences taking place at the same time.

By such careful and deliberate study of this problem on the broadest possible basis we believe a religion can develop that will be consistent with scientific and democratic freedom, and that will provide the ideational, emotional, and integrating force for human life based on the dignity of the individual and the brotherhood of all men. Such a religion, the authors believe, must be found if religion is to continue to play a meaningful and useful role in human affairs.